EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE
AND
INTERCESSION
FOR THE DEPARTED

H. MORTIMER LUCKOCK D. D.

EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND INTERCESSION FOR THE DEPARTED

EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

AND

INTERCESSION FOR THE DEPARTED

BOTH CONSISTENT WITH THE
TEACHING OF THE
BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

A
COURSE OF ADDRESSES

BY

H. MORTIMER LUCKOCK, D.D.
DEAN OF LICHFIELD

UNITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
BV
828
L82
1907

LONDON
SKEFFINGTON & SON
34, SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.
PUBLISHERS TO HIS MAJESTY THE KING
1907

UNITED THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY

✠

BERKELEY GULIELMO RANDOLPH, S.T.P.

COLL : ELIENS : THEOL : PRINCIPI

AMICITIÆ ERGO ARCTISSIMÆ

IPSE OLIM PRINCEPS

LIBELLUM QUALEMCUNQUE DEDICAT

H.M.L.

Preface.

THE subjects of the following Addresses have long occupied my thoughts and I have studied much that has been written upon them, especially on Worship in Jewish literature. I have, moreover, lectured upon them from time to time to gatherings of the Clergy and others, and also been asked to put into print what I have said, as likely to help my brethren to teach their people. How often has the confession been made by the Clergy: "there are many doctrines that I hold without any misgivings, but which from lack of study I am unable to enforce in clear and convincing argument!" And yet they were reminded before their ordination

unto "how weighty an office and charge they were called" viz., "to teach" as well as to premonish, "to feed and provide for the Lord's family," and they promised "with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's word." There ought then to be no acquiescence, without at least a determined effort, in the above Confession.

The late Bishop Woodford, of Ely, the clearest exponent of Church doctrine I have ever known, to whom I was Examining Chaplain for many years, was never tired of impressing upon his Clergy the imperative necessity of distinctive and dogmatic teaching, especially in an age of intellectual enquiry, if the Church is to hold its own in the world.

In view of encouraging this, he induced me to write a series of Instructions on one of the Gospels, putting his Episcopal *imprimatur* upon them in an

Introduction to the volume, as follows: "It might, I think, be desirable to make the Sunday morning Sermon an expository Address or Instruction, reserving the Sermon proper for the evening service. I heartily commend these Addresses to the Clergy of my Diocese for use in their Churches." His counsel I know was adopted.

I do not expect that the following will be used in the same way, but I am not without hope that they may be found useful in some parishes for instruction to Guilds and Communicants' Classes, to which the subjects ought to prove especially attractive.

The title is not strictly accurate for they have not been delivered by me as "a course." I have given most of them, in substance at least, sometimes singly, sometimes two or three together, but it seemed to me that they would be more useful, if I

combined them in a connected and consecutive series. What led immediately to the expansion and publication was an expressed wish that I would do something of the kind, as the outcome of a Sermon on the two subjects preached at the urgent request of the President at the Requiem for the Departed Members of the English Church Union, on November 21st, last year, in S. Mary Magdalene's, Munster Square.

The great fact that I have been anxious to establish is the consistency both of the doctrine and practice with the principles of our Book of Common Prayer; and I trust the abundance of contemporary evidence that I have brought forward in illustration, will serve to show that there is much more underlying certain expressions than appears on the surface.

Perhaps I shall save myself from the too oft-

repeated charge of disloyalty to Episcopal authority, if I say that the Requiem Service, in which I was privileged to take part, has for several years had the full sanction of the Bishop of London. The reader will find in the last Address how much may be gained if in such special services, as I was assured was the case at this one, nothing be introduced without Episcopal sanction. It will naturally deprive us of the full expression of what we desire, but for this we must be content to hope and pray.

I have dwelt at great length on the historic continuity of our Public Worship. It has long been a peculiarly fascinating occupation to me to trace out, not only in principle but in details, correspondences in Jewish and Christian Worship Church, which, though commonly spoken of as belonging to two Churches, were rightly designated as one by perhaps the most learned theologian and

ecclesiastic of the last century, Bishop Wordsworth, of Lincoln.

This unity comes out mainly in the doctrine of Sacrificial Worship; and it certainly lends a delightful charm to membership of our Church to be able to trace back the principles of the Worship which we are offering to-day through several thousand years.

My second subject, the habit of interceding in public service for the departed, has, it is true, no such lengthened history by reason of the rare and vague belief of the Jews in the life after death. We shall, however, have no difficulty in carrying it back nineteen centuries, and illustrating the truth of what Canon Liddon once wrote to me, viz., that the practice, public as well as private, was as much a part of the life of the Early Church as the worship of our Lord.

My thanks are due to Canon Randolph for supervising some of the more important points of doctrine; and also to my son, Rev. Arthur M. Luckock, for looking over and correcting the Proof Sheets.

I now send forth these addresses with an earnest hope and prayer that they quicken in all who read them a deeper interest in the antiquity of our Forms of Worship, and love for the doctrine and practice of the Primitive Church, which, it is well to remember, was put forward so often at the Reformation as the best standard to be aimed at.

H. M. L.

The Feast of the Epiphany, 1907.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

		PAGE
I.	The Chief Features of Jewish Worship . .	1
II.	A Continuity of the same through Christian Worship	14
III.	The complex Levitical System of Sacrifice and the Ritual Actions explained . . .	26
IV.	Sacrificial Worship Continued down to the present time	40
V.	Answers to popular objections, especially that this Continuity was broken at the Reformation	59
VI.	Continuity in Non-Sacrificial Worship . .	79
VII.	Eucharistic Intercession for the Departed a natural development in the Christian Church	95
VIII.	Contemporary Evidence of its Preservation, though curtailed, under the stress and strain of the Sixteenth Century	106
IX.	Suggested Means for regaining in greater fulness our Catholic Heritage	120

CHAPTER I.

The Chief Features of Jewish Worship.

THE main purpose of these Addresses is to show that there is a continuity of Worship in its essential principles and features from the first revelation which God gave to Moses, down to the present time.

We shall endeavour to describe and unravel the complex system of that which was offered to God in the Tabernacle and Temple; to explain with what changes and necessary modifications the same was adopted into the Primitive Church of Christ; and how, after being purified where necessary, it was Providentially preserved for the Church in this land, through all the vicissitudes of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In other words, we hope to establish the contention, that the Book of Common Prayer, which is now in use in the Church of England, was not in any sense a new Creation of the

Reformers, but can trace its lineal descent from the Primitive Liturgies, and through them to the worship of the Jews.

As bearing upon this we interpret God's statement of His own nature—"I am the Lord, I change not,"[1] as applying not only to His relationship to mankind, but also to their obligation to Himself, especially to recognising His permanent claim to receive the homage which is due from the creature to the Creator. The context gives the declaration an immediate connexion with the Messianic times, when He says that the offering of His people would be "as in the days of old, and as in former years." It will be further shown from the same inspired Revelation that it is in accordance with His will that this homage should find outward and visible expression as well as be inwardly felt.[2]

There is, however, a common belief that the ceremonial was not for all the resulting extension, but restricted to the duration of the Old Dispensation. But our Lord Himself has told us that whatever change was brought about by the Incarnation was

[1] Malachi iii. 6.

[2] [illegible]

only by way of growth and development; that is that He did not aim at overthrowing the Jewish system, but only at imparting to it new life and vigour by the Gift of the Holy Spirit. "Think not that I came," He said, "to destroy the Law or the Prophets, but to fulfil."[1]

This revelation of His purpose is of such vital importance that it calls for explanation. It may be illustrated by two examples. Circumcision was an external act, an initiatory Rite, admitting a Jewish child into covenant privileges and duties, but unaccompanied by any spiritual gift to enable him to enjoy the one or discharge the other aright. Baptism, on the other hand, not only gave the same to the Christian child, but also carried with it the supernatural influence of the Holy Spirit, enabling the baptised to meet his new responsibilities and enjoy its privileges.

[1] S. Matt. v. 17, *i.e.* fill out, or fill full. As it is in S. John xv. 12, 'that your joy may be fulfilled,' *i.e.* clearly, 'filled full.' 2 Cor. x. 6. "When your obedience is fulfilled," *i.e.* fully manifested. So also in the Communion Office, "that we may be fulfilled with Thy grace," where it must be the same. In regard to the Law, Alford says, it is "giving to it a deeper and holier sense," which means the interpretation we accept in reference to worship.

The second illustration is of the same kind but more germane to the subject in hand, viz. : Sacrifice. The Jewish sacrifices looked forward to the Great Sacrifice of the Cross, into which they were all gathered up, and from which they derived their virtue. The Christian Sacrifice looks back to the same, and becomes efficacious by and through its merits alone. Herein they are alike, but there is one distinguishing feature between them ; we can find no mention anywhere in the Old Testament to indicate that the offerer received any spiritual grace or blessing from partaking of the body of the victim ; but in the Holy Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ, of which he eats, become to him "the power of an endless life." "Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day."[1]

All this will have served at least to prepare the way for a comparison between the Worship of the

[1] S. John vi. 54. For a full examination of the arguments of those who deny its reference to the Holy Eucharist, the reader is referred to Chap. xxviii. on "The Discourse on Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Synagogue of Capernaum," in *The Special Characteristics of the Four Gospels*, by the author.

two Covenants; and we shall find that some of the coincidences in principle are very striking, and often even in detail. What then are the most characteristic features or "notes," as they are technically called, of Jewish Worship? We have summed them up under five heads, viz.: Sacrifice; the employment of Liturgical or Ministerial officers[1]; Rites and Ceremonies; Symbolism; and lastly, Splendour and stately Dignity.

The first "note" is Sacrifice; this, however, we pass by for the present, as it requires an Address to itself, and will come better in more immediate connexion with the Holy Eucharist.

The second feature is the importance that was attached to the Ministerial Office. "Liturgical" seems to comprehend briefly what is meant, and in the light of the original secular use of the term is very suggestive of Public Worship. In Greece a Liturgy was a State or political service, the

[1] This feature has sometimes been designated "mediatorial," but this is calculated to offend in connection with the "One Mediator," when it is applied to Christian Worship, though the distinction is unnecessary. *Cf.* Willis, *On the Worship of the Old Covenant*, p. 217, 228.

essential character of which was, that it should be performed by a chosen few in behalf of the many.[1] By God's appointment, Worship was to be offered to Him, not directly but through the intervention of a human minister; and it illustrates a principle which runs through man's history, viz.: that with certain exceptions, he is made dependent upon his fellow-creatures for spiritual blessings.

Under the Jewish Dispensations the Ministry was of three Orders, High-Priest, Priests and Levites. The first and second had inalienable functions, the third were set apart mainly to assist the Priests. But while it was the office of the one to present and plead the efficacy of the blood shed in sacrifice, and of the other

[1] It was first employed for State burdens, such as providing for national emergencies, sometimes undertaken voluntarily by, or sometimes imposed upon, a few wealthy citizens. The reader will find a most interesting account of the adoption of the term by the Church in Trench's N. T. Synonyms, i. 139. "The reasons," he says, "which induced this were the same which caused it to turn basilicas—buildings, that is, which had been used in civil life—more willingly than temples into churches; namely because they were haunted with the clinging associations of heathenism." But he shows how in the O. T. a liturgy had been ascribed to the office of Priests and Levites, who were separated to minister in holy things.

to lead the praises of the sanctuary, the people had a definite part of their own in Public Worship. The offerer of the sacrifice killed the victim, and joined in the singing of Psalms especially, when they accompanied the offering of sacrifice. One-tenth of the tribe of Levi was set apart to play and sing in the Temple Service. There are, however, many indications that it was also at times and in parts congregational. Over and over again, for instance, we are reminded that all the assembled worshippers joined in the Service crying aloud with a redoubled response and a great volume of sound, Amen, Amen, as they praised the Name of the Lord.[1]

A third "note" was its Rites and Ceremonies, that is, worship expressed through definite fixed forms, and with various bodily actions, postures, gestures and the like. For these God gave many directions and rigid rules to show His claim for the homage of the whole man, body as well as spirit. Special vestments were to be worn for different rites by Priests and Levites. The people bowed the head; kneeled down or stood; took the shoes from off their feet; began their prayer with downcast look,

[1] Chron. xvi. 36.

then lifted up their hands. And elaborate orders were given to inculcate reverence in their ritual; always to pray towards the Holy of Holies and never to turn their back upon it till they had reached the Gate Nicanor, when it disappeared from sight.

Whenever the Sacred Name of Jehovah occurred in the reading of Scripture, a pause was made, while the whole congregation, whether in Temple or Synagogue, prostrated themselves, and then sang a Doxology, "Blessed be the Name; the Glory of His Kingdom is for ever and ever."

Indeed, so carefully was their worship fenced and guarded, that the Mishnah[1] contains nearly fifty penalties for carelessness and irreverence, and in the Bible itself we learn that some transgressors were punished even by death. The Ark of the Lord was so holy that when moved it had to be borne on the shoulders of the Levites; but Uzzah forgot the restriction, touched it with unhallowed hands,[2] and died immediately by the side of the Ark. The Sacred Chronicler says, "The anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzah, and He smote him, because

[1] *Cf.* Lightfoot's Works, *Horæ Hebraicæ*, ix. 121.

[2] Josephus, *Antiq.*, vii., v. 2.

he put his hand to the Ark; and there he died before God."[1]

Again, the Jewish system was symbolical, and so marked was this characteristic that we may say without exaggeration that it was permeated through and through in all its parts by symbolism. This will be best illustrated by the structure of the Tabernacle in which the revealed order of worship was first offered. This was divided into three parts, an outer Court, the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, with a progression of sanctity for approaching the Divine Presence. The whole congregation of Israel was admitted into the first, which was only partially enclosed, because any Israelite might pass in and out as he pleased. It symbolised the Jewish Nation.

Before the next Court, into which the Priests, and Levites when attending upon them, were admitted, there was placed a great Laver, implying the need of purification for greater nearness to God; and it was ordered that the ministers might tread its floor only with bare feet, after the example of Moses before the burning bush. It was lighted by the seven-branched Candlestick. Lastly, its entrance was

[1] 1 Chron. xiii. 10.

guarded by a huge curtain[1] reaching from the apex of the Tent to the ground. This Court symbolised the Jewish Church.

Symbolism culminated in the third Court, or Holy of Holies, in which was a very emblem of the Divine Presence, in the mystic Cloud or Shekinah resting above the Mercy-Seat. There was no light in it save that which was supernaturally reflected from this. The measurement of this Shrine was a perfect cube; all its furniture and ornaments were of the most precious metals, chiefly of the finest gold. The Veil that concealed and guarded it from intrusion was double instead of single; and none might enter or draw it aside save the High-Priest and that only once a year, and not even he in his ordinary vestments, but in one peculiarly expressive of purity, which is requisite for them that see God. This Court was an emblem of Heaven itself.

[1] It is much disputed whether it was this or the Veil before the Holy Place that was rent at the Crucifixion. The Fathers mostly considered that it was the former, but the Holy of Holies, which symbolized Heaven, was not opened by the Death but by the Ascension of Christ, and some have therefore argued that as His Death opened the Church to the world, it must have been the other Veil. *Cf.* Willis, *Worship, &c.*, App. iii. Douglas, *Jerusalem the Golden.*

Not only were the materials but also the colours ordered by God Himself to be employed in His service highly symbolical.[1] Three of these will suffice by way of illustration, scarlet, blue and white.[2]

Scarlet, the colour of blood was symbolical of the atoning sacrifices, it being written again and again in the Scriptures, "that it is the blood," *i.e.* the life of the victim[3] which makes atonement; the victim's life being accepted by God in place of the transgressor's. This colour, then, was, so to speak, a constant prophecy, written up before the eyes of the worshippers, of Him Who came into the world, to lay down His life as a vicarious Sacrifice for the sins of mankind.

Blue, which was much used, is the colour of the sky, and was calculated to direct men's minds to thoughts of heaven and of Him Who dwelleth therein.

White carries with it a very obvious symbolism, as the best earthly representation of moral purity;

[1] *Cf.* Exod. xxviii.

[2] The whole system should be studied in *The Ancient use of Liturgical Colours*, by Rolfe.

[3] Gen. ix. 4. Lev. xvii. 11. Deut. xii. 23.

and in dress it was so significant that it was not, as with us, confined to the Ministry, clerical or lay, but extended to the whole congregation,[1] who were usually clothed in white.

There is a touching memorial of this ancient custom in modern Synagogues, every Jew taking from a box under his seat and putting over his head a white veil, or Talith, before the worship begins.

The last feature to be noticed is the beauty and grandeur of all the accessories of Jewish Worship. Take these as they are exhibited in connexion with the two great principles which run through all the system, sacrifice and purification. What could give us a nobler idea of the value of the one, or of the need of the other, than the description of the Altar and Laver, in the Book of Chronicles?[2] Josephus[3] sums it up briefly, saying of the Great Altar, on which sacrifices were offered, that it was thirty feet in breadth and thirty in length and fifteen in height. The Laver before the Holy

[1] Some writers have maintained that this is a comparatively modern custom, from the hypothetical case S. Paul puts in 1 Cor. xi. 4, and that the veil or shawl was only worn by women during worship.—*Cf.* Smith, *Dict. of the Bible*.

[2] 2 Chron. iv. 1-5. [3] *Antiq. of the Jews*, viii., iii. 7.

Place, he tells us, was "a brazen sea," so called from its largeness; and it was encircled by figures of twelve oxen looking to the four winds, and contained no less than three thousand baths of pure water. We may argue the exceeding grandeur of the whole Building from that of its parts.

Now all this magnificence, whether of Tabernacle or Temple, this splendid environment, the pomp and circumstance of worship to which all the features we have considered bear witness, was simply a recognition of the majesty of Him Whom it was designed to honour.

David said that "it must be exceeding magnifical"[1] because it was "for the Lord." Solomon was filled with awe that he should presume to build a House to Him, Who was so great. "Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty."[2]

The history of the Christian Church will show that it inherited the same conception of what is due from the creature to the Creator in all time, and that, whenever circumstances allowed, it was carried out.

[1] 1 Chron. xxii. 5. [2] *Id.* xxix. 11.

CHAPTER II.

A Continuity of the same through Christian Worship.

BY the continuity of Jewish Worship with that of the Christian Church it is not meant that it passed from one to the other without any breach, or has been maintained in its integrity, as God had revealed His purpose when He shewed Moses the pattern of it in the Mount.[1] From the exigency of circumstances both were impossible.

The one great impediment to the unbroken continuity of some at least of the distinguishing features, which we have described, was the determined opposition to Christianity offered both by Jews and heathen at the very outset. When the organisation of the Church began under the guidance of the Twelve Apostles, they found themselves in their corporate capacity, like Athanasius as an individual

[1] Exod. xxv. 40. Heb. viii. 5.

in later times, with the whole world against them. Till persecution ceased at the close of the third century, and the Church was placed by the conversion of Constantine under the ægis of Imperial favour and protection, it would have been worse than idle for its rulers to have attempted to build up a system of Worship on the lines laid down by the Jewish Church.

History has preserved the records of the straits and trials it passed through, when they held their assemblies in obscurity and secret, often in the dens and caves of the earth, and celebrated the Mysteries in the subterranean chapels they formed in the Catacombs. To have tried to offer more than the simplest kind of worship would have betrayed their hiding-place, and courted persecution; but, as we shall see, that one important principle, that of sacrifice, was possible and was zealously guarded even then.

Now let us take the "notes" of the Christian Church and examine them, as we did the Jewish, consecutively, only, as before, postponing that of sacrifice in order to consider it fully in its more immediate relation to Eucharistic Worship, in which it became enshrined.

The Liturgical character of worship was inherited by the Christian Church without any diminution or interruption. The Holy Eucharist, which has always been accounted the highest of the Church's Services, was celebrated from Pentecost onwards and uninterruptedly. S. Luke records that after this the first converts "continued stedfastly in breaking bread at home,"[1] *i.e.*, celebrating the Liturgy or Memorial of Christ's Sacrifice. There can be no doubt what is meant, for the oldest Version of the New Testament, the Syriac Peshito, at the close of the first century renders it "breaking the Eucharist;" and as there is no trace in history of this having ever been offered or celebrated save by a duly appointed priest, it must have been administered Liturgically.[2] It would seem that some persons attempted to do it without this qualification, but suffered in consequence the Divine displeasure, for S. Jude says, "they perished in the gainsaying of Coreh."[3]

[1] Wrongly translated "from house to house" in the A.V., *cf*, *The Divine Liturgy*, by the Author, p. 26.

[2] The essence of a Liturgy should be that it is a Service for the many offered by a few. *Supra* p. 6. n.

[3] Ep. of S. Jude 11.

There was, it is true, a distinction between the admission into the priesthood in the Jewish and Christian Dispensations, for the former was inherited, according to God's appointment, by birth in the family of Aaron, the latter, after Christ's direction, by a spiritual descent or consecration through the Apostolical Succession.[1]

There is another correspondence in the office of the Ministry, for as the Levites were set apart to assist the Jewish Priests, so subordinate officers, especially Deacons, fulfilled the same function in the Catholic Church. One of the Apostolic Fathers says that the peculiar ministration of the Levites devolved on Deacons, and other writers testify to the same.[2]

And this particular duty, viz., to assist the priest, has continued to the present day; before any layman receives his commission in the laying on of hands, the ordaining Bishop reminds him that "it appertaineth to the Office of a Deacon, in the Church

[1] The Apostles acted upon Christ's declaration, "As My Father hath sent Me, even so send I you." S. John xx. 21. They commissioned others, *e.g.* Titus and Timothy, as Christ had been commissioned by the Father to send them.

[2] S. Clem. ad. Cor. i. 40. S. Ambrose, *De officiis Min.* i. 50.

where he shall be appointed to serve, to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and specially when he administereth the Holy Communion."

The next "note" of worship is its ritual and ceremonial character. Sometimes it has been assumed and argued that the Founder struck a death-blow at forms and ceremonies when He told the Samaritan woman that the worship which God loved was "in spirit and in truth."[1] The declaration is exactly akin to another which He repeated several times: "I will have mercy and not sacrifice."[2]

What He denounced in both cases was, not the outward and visible act in itself, but only when it lacked that inspiring and quickening motive, which alone could make it acceptable to God.

The prophets, from whom He quoted, were speaking of sacrifice as it had been degraded from the high ideal, which God stamped upon it, into that outward formalism, which had taken the very heart out of the system, stopping the warm flow of life-giving blood and making it worthless.

Christ, in like manner, must have felt that the woman, who was boasting of the superiority of the

[1] S. John iv. 23. [2] S. Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7

place of Samaritan worship, had lost all sense of the incongruity of her life of impurity with that offering which she fancied satisfied God; and He simply repeated to her what the prophets[1] before Him had said to the Jews, which is briefly this, the body without the spirit is dead.

The very first mention of the subject in the Acts of the Apostles shows that spiritual worship did not exclude forms; for we are there told that even prayer was not extempore, but had become formulated; for it is recorded that they had a definite and precomposed service—the first converts "continued stedfastly in *the* Breaking of Bread and in *the* Prayers."[2]

When the Church became free to carry out those directions, which during the Forty Days after the Ascension Christ had given to the Apostles, "speaking of things concerning 'the Kingdom of God'"[3] (which

[1] Hosea vi. 6. Micah vi. 8.

[2] The use of the definite Article is very significant, pointing to recognised forms.

[3] *e.g.* In S. Matthew xiii. our Lord predicted what the Church would be by telling in several parables what "the Kingdom of Heaven" was like: and often in the first Gospel it is so designated.

is a recognised synonym for "the Church"), the principles of Ritual worship rapidly developed under the influence of the Holy Spirit; and a study of the Early Liturgies shows how external ceremonies, with numerous reverential observances, became an integral part of it Further, it has always been held that the Primitive Church, both for doctrine and practice, is the standard to be aimed at. Whether we define the period according to the modern acceptation of the term, as embracing six centuries, or restrict its limit to the middle of the fifth,[1] we have ample testimony for the continuity of a ceremonial worship.

The principle of symbolism also was continued in the Church. There was the same graduated sanctity as soon as churches were built, in the different parts, of Nave, and Choir, and Sanctuary, regulated by the sacred idea of approach to the Divine Presence. The Altar and its Service were designated by a variety of epithets such as mystic, dreadful, hallowed, divine and one the most frequent has no exact equivalent in our language, but indicates that it made the worshipper shudder with awe.[2]

[1] At the Council of Chalcedon. 451.

[2] In the Liturgies and Fathers, φρικτή. μυστική, κ τ.λ.

Due and lowly reverence was paid to it, for though it is difficult to discover definite records of an early practice, it is a fair conclusion that if, as we shall see, the same doctrine was continued, it would naturally take with it similar marks of honour. Further its universal observance in later days points to primitive authority; and though at the present time there is no rubrical or canonical obligation, the fact remains that it was enjoined long after the Reformation, in statutes of the Cathedrals,[1] which have been commonly designated, "the exemplary" Churches of the land. It is the same with Lights on the Altar, which whether, as has been maintained, under the conditions of worship in the first three centuries, their use was not symbolical, but for a practical purpose, it is certain that the necessary lights of this period became the ceremonial lights of the next, when the conditions changed; and they suggested to the worshipper, like the Shekinah of old, the Divine Presence of Him, Who is "The Light of the World."

Further the practice of the Jews to face the

[1] *e.g.* Durham, Winchester, Christ Church, Lichfield, &c.

Holy of Holies in all their ministrations became universal with Christians,[1] and no serious departure from it took place till the great dispute between the Presbyterians and Bishops, at the Savoy Conference in 1661; where it was urged that the Minister should always turn to the people, "so that he might best be heard," but the Bishops insisted that only "when he speaks to them as in Lessons, Absolution and Benediction, is it convenient that he turns towards them. When he speaks for them to God, it is fit that they should all turn another way," *i.e.* towards the Altar.[2]

One more illustration of symbolism may be drawn from the Orientation of churches,[3] corresponding to the *Kibleh* of the Jewish Synagogues, which always turned towards the Holy of Holies. The idea is the same with us, save that our churches

[1] Basil *de Spiritu Sancto*, 27. *Apost. Constit.*, ii. 57. Clem. Alex. *Strom*, vii., viii.

[2] Cardwell's *Conferences*, p. 353. The "other way" was clearly as we have explained, because it was a common Puritan complaint that the Priest turned his back upon the people by facing Eastward.

[3] Synagogues in Babylon, and countries East of Jerusalem would face Westwards.

are built Eastwards, looking towards the dawn, that is towards Christ, Who is the Sun of Righteousness, the Day Spring from on high [1] Indeed, so wide-spread was this symbolical practice, that Christians were charged with idolatry for worshipping the Sun.

The last feature in worship to be considered is its beauty and grandeur. One serious obstacle to the preservation of this at the beginning was the poverty of the first converts to Christianity. If the Apostles speak of any of them as being "rich," it was only in faith or wisdom, never in worldly possessions: and even if they had been able to give of their abundance for such a purpose, it would have roused the jealousy of the heathen, who would ill brook from an "upstart sect" any worship or buildings that could offer a counter attraction to their own temples.

The conversation of our Lord with the woman of Samaria touching places of worship has been misinterpreted to their disparagement. The Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim, which she implied was the only privileged place, was already in ruins; and with

[1] *Cf. Divine Liturgy*, by the Author, p. 119.

His prophetic sight He saw the Temple in Jerusalem, to which the highest form of worship had been strictly confined, about to be destroyed; and when He said that the time was coming when neither in the one nor the other should worship be offered, He meant that all restriction to local centres would cease, and the worship of the Father would become wide as the world itself, which the Church was destined to embrace.

And so it was; at the close of the third century, as by an enchanter's wand, splendid buildings began to spring up in every land. We read in the Life of Constantine that he testified "his reverence for the King of kings by divine and princely offerings of gold and silver and embroidered hangings" for the church, which his mother Helena had built "with all possible splendour" on the site where the Blessed Virgin had given birth to the Holy Child.[1] By the same Emperor, Roman Basilicas, which were renowned for their magnificence, were given up to the Christians for Public Worship.

To take another epoch, look at the Middle Ages, when with an unparalleled expenditure of labour and

[1] Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii. 42.

wealth the Cathedrals were erected, in magnitude and costliness quite out of proportion to their practical utility. They were so built to carry out the great principle which David, who refused to offer to God that which cost him nothing, expressed so strongly in his memorable words, "The House that is to be builded for the Lord must be exceeding magnifical, of fame and of glory throughout all countries."[1] Again, after the Cathedrals had fallen into decay in an age when religion waxed cold, through the length and breadth of Europe they have been restored in these later times to almost more than their original splendour.

The one inspiring motive throughout has been to make the places of worship worthy of Him, Who condescends to sit enthroned amid the praises of His people.

Thus we have seen that all the subordinate features and accessories of worship have been passed on from century to century, and the vision will have prepared us also for the continuity of sacrifice, which was made by God Himself the centre and dominant principle of that great system of homage which is due from the creature to the Creator.

[1] Chronicles xxii. 5.

CHAPTER III.

The complex Levitical System of Sacrifice and the Ritual Actions explained.

THE worship of the Old Covenant was, as we said, pre-eminently sacrificial. The whole system of it is revealed in the Book of Leviticus, but is rarely studied or understood, and it excites little interest. This is probably the reason why it is less read than any other part of the Bible.[1] Those, however, who have examined it closely, have been able to educe from its intricacies clear and intelligible conclusions. The manifold sacrifices described therein may all be classified in three orders or groups, of which the chief are the burnt offering, the sin offering, and the peace offering. The burnt offering bespoke complete self-dedication and surrender to God of the whole man,

[1] I remember once at a Church Congress hearing a leader of the Church Association, who was denouncing Sacrificial doctrine, asked if he had ever read this Book? He gave no reply.

body, soul and spirit. Hence it was called "the whole burnt offering"; further the victim was wholly consumed, except at least the skin, which was set apart for the priests' clothing, in order to preserve the principle that "they which wait at the altar should live of the altar."[1] All the rest, as the Hebrew designation of it, viz., "the ascending" sacrifice, implies, went up in flame and smoke to God. It was, in Jewish eyes, the archetype of the highest form of worship—the symbol of praise pure and simple—for what God is, not for anything He gives to the offerer. As such it was never intermitted, but regarded as of perpetual obligation, sacrificed every morning and evening. Indeed so eager were the Jews to begin each day with this recognition of God's paramount claim, tradition says that they posted a watchman[2] on the highest point of the Temple to give the signal of returning

[1] Lev. vii. 8. 1 Cor. ix. 13.

[2] This was probably the figure in the prophet's mind in the "Burden of Dumah." "He calleth to me out of Seir, Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?" Such was the enquiry of the Levitical Guard as they paced the Temple through the long hours of darkness. Isaiah xxi. 11. *Cf.* also for the tradition, *Talmon & Hadassah*, by Slight.

dawn; and immediately the first ray shot above the horizon, he cried aloud, "Light—light, even unto Hebron," and at once the victim was slain.

The sin offering, of which the most important was offered for the sins of the whole people on the Day of Atonement, had for its dominant feature propitiation, effected through blood shed on this occasion by the High Priest,[1] and pleaded by him, the whole congregation by virtue of their lay-priesthood joining in his intercession for the sins of the nation. The reason he slew the victims was because one was *for himself;* he slew it as a sinner, not as a priest. The second victim he slew for the people, but again as identifying himself with them as their representative, not as a priest.

The peace offering had for its object communion always with God, sometimes also with one's fellows as at the Passover. This was symbolised by the fact that all the worshippers participated in the body of the victim, first presented by the offerer to God, and then given back by Him to them.

Thus it will be seen we have a comprehensive view of man's true relationship to God as expressed in

[1] Lev. xvi. 11, 15.

sacrificial worship. In the first offering the creature acknowledges Him as the Creator, praising His Holy Name; in the second, he comes before Him as the Judge, to ask for the pardon of his sins; in the last, to thank Him as the Father "from Whom cometh down every good and perfect gift."[1]

Now for a thorough understanding of the Great Sacrifice, of which all the above were types, as well as of the Holy Eucharist, it will be necessary to examine the import of the Ritual Acts by which they were offered or accompanied. In the case of an animal sacrifice, *i.e.* in which blood was shed, they were five in number.[2]

The first act was the surrender of the victim by the offerer and the presentation of it to the priest at the door of the Temple, immediately in front of the Great Altar. This embodied the essential idea

[1] S. James i. 17.

[2] Writers have not always so restricted them, but this division we think the best. *Cf.* Outram, *de Sacrificiis;* Kurtz, *Sacrificial Worship of the Old Testament.* Willis, in *Worship of the Old Covenant*, advocates the sixfold division, making a distinction between the consumption of the victim by fire, as in the Burnt Offering, and by the worshippers, which seems unnecessary.

of sacrifice; a voluntary and unreserved renunciation of all claim to it in future.

The victim was brought to a priest, because he was the judge whether it fulfilled the legal conditions, viz. of proper age, without spot or blemish, before any further step was taken.

If the victim was duly qualified, the next act was for the offerer to lay his hands upon its head, to transfer symbolically his sins to the substitute about to die in his stead and bear the merited punishment of his guilt.[1] The Rabbis[2] dwell much upon this rite and emphasise the need of pressing as heavily as possible, so as to leave nothing untransferred. They say it must be done "with all one's force and strength." Neither was it without significance that this act was rigidly restricted to the transgressor; no bye-stander under any circumstances might join in it. This imposition of hands was accompanied by confession of the sin for which the

[1] Attempts have been made to explain this interpretation away, but Kurtz has argued very conclusively in favour of it.

[2] Maimonides frequently. *Cf.* Lightfoot, *Temple Service*, viii. 1.

offering was made.[1] The commonest form of confession was, "I beseech Thee, O Lord, I have sinned, I have trespassed, I have rebelled, particularly I have done so and so (specifying the act), but now I repent and let this be my expiation." The importance of this confession is indicated by its being made in the hearing of a priest, and further by the necessity of its thoroughness testified to by the belief of the Rabbis that "he who was frequent and long in confession was to be praised."[2]

The third act was the killing of the victim. This was done not by the priest, save in exceptional cases, but by the transgressor, with his own hand, in token that he admitted by taking the life of his substitute that "the wages of sin is death," and that he had, save through the mercy of God, incurred the penalty.

The fourth, the sprinkling of blood upon the Altar, was that which gave its efficacy to the sacrifice. This was a distinctly sacerdotal function, far higher and more solemn than the inspection of the victim, or the being present during the confession;[3] and

[1] Lev. v. 5. [2] *Cf.* Outram, on Maimonides, p. 127.

[3] The absolution of a penitent, such as Christ commissioned

without it the animal slain differed little or nothing from one slaughtered in the shambles for common food. This act was performed in a variety of ways; sometimes the blood was sprinkled on the brazen Altar, sometimes on the Altar of Incense before the Veil, more rarely, on the Day of Atonement once a year, on the Mercy Seat itself above the Ark.

The significance lay in the fact that the blood was the life; "the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement by reason of the life" (R.V.),[1] for such is a more correct rendering than "for the soul" (A.V.).

"The great lesson taught by this is the necessity of a mediator between God and sinful man . . . . none but the priest alone, holding his mediatorial commission direct from God, could present the blood upon the Altar to make an atonement."[2] This is a

the Apostles to pronounce, is higher than anything noticed in connection with this.

[1] Lev. xvii. 11. The R.V. has followed the Hebrew, the A.V. the Septuagint and Vulgate.

[2] Willis, p. 45.

further illustration of the Liturgical character of Jewish Worship on which we dwelt before. We shall enter into it more fully in connection with Christ's Sacrifice, and that which He instituted in the Holy Eucharist.

The fifth ritual act was the consumption of the body of the victim, sometimes by fire, in which the prominent idea was its acceptance by God as "an odour of a sweet smelling sacrifice." Indeed from being first placed on the Altar and then "going up" in flame and smoke it was regarded as the food or bread of God Himself.[1] Sometimes, it was partaken of as a meal by the priest or offerer; in the Paschal Sacrifice, by all the people. In the cases where it was so eaten we claim for it the title of "the Food of God,"[2] not as being consumed by Him, but because it was received from the Altar, or as it was once happily called in later times, "God's Board;"[3] and hence we have combined the two

[1] Lev. iii. 11, xxi. 16, 17, 21.

[2] This designation first originated in the idea that, as all went up in smoke and fire to God, He was supposed to have consumed it.

[3] In the Rubric before the Prayer of Humble Access

as one ritual act. In either case the keynote of communion or fellowship between the giver and the receiver is preserved.

Now inasmuch as all Jewish sacrifices looked forward to and were typical of the Great Sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the whole world, we expect to find in the Antitype the same characteristic principles reproduced, and *mutatis mutandis* similar Ritual actions repeated.

The former, as embodied severally in the three groups, representing self-surrender, propitiation, and communion, need little or no illustration in the Sacrifice of Him, Who defined the ruling principle of His Life to be not to do His own will "but the will of Him that sent Him,"[1] enforced again and again, as the beloved disciple has so frequently told us. He made the surrender first in the eternal counsels of the Godhead, and finally in the Garden of Gethsemane. It testifies to the highest possible type of self-dedication, the first of the Jewish groups of sacrifice.

in 1 P.B. Edw. VI., "Goddesborde," which was used for many centuries in England. *Cf.* Simmons' *Lay Folk's Mass Book*, 358; and *Divine Liturgy* by the Author, 56.

[1] S. John iv. 34; v. 30; vi. 38-39.

The propitiatory virtue of sacrifice foreshadowed in the second group was enlarged so as to have no limitation to its efficacy: no longer confined to an individual transgressor, as in the ordinary sin offering or trespass offering, or even, as in the extraordinary on the Day of Atonement, for "all the congregation of Israel,"[1] but by His Death He made satisfaction for the sins all fallen men, living and dead; and hence He was hailed by the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world."[2]

The third class of sacrifices had for its fundamental conception the reconciliation of the offerer with God. Christ expanded its purpose through His Cross and Passion so as not only to bring man into union with God, but to join together Jew and Gentile "in the unity of the Spirit, and the bond of peace." Hence S. Paul was able to speak with confidence, and say to his Ephesian converts, "He is our peace, Who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition *between us* . . . . for to make in Himself of twain one new man, so making peace; and that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby;"

[1] Lev. xvii. 11-28. [2] S. John i. 29.

i.e. not by His body, as it is commonly interpreted, but "by it," that is, His cross.[1]

Thus by His Archetypal Sacrifice He gathered into one and realised in its entirety every aim and purpose foreordained by the complex Levitical system.

It only remains now to show how He carried it out by the same ritual acts that were enjoined under the Law.

For not only was the general principle of Jewish sacrifice strictly maintained in Christ's Sacrifice of Himself, but even that which regulated the several actions by which it was accomplished. The first step was the absolute surrender of the victim. The only difference lay in the fact that the offerer of the typical sacrifice made and completed it by one act; the Antitype by repeated and continued acts of self-dedication to the Father all through life, dating back to the surrender in Their divine counsels before the world began; and at the Incarnation, when He said "I came down from heaven, not to do Mine own will, but the will of Him that sent Me";[2] and in

[1] This is the meaning in a somewhat parallel passage. Col. ii. 14.

[2] S. John vi. 38.

the last agony "not as I will but as Thou wilt;" "Thy will be done."

By the second act, He offered Himself as a vicarious Sacrifice, being made "sin for us"—He, "Who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him."[1] Thus fulfilling the ancient prophecies, "being made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is everyone that hangeth on a tree;"[2] thus He died the death of the worst malefactor, though Himself "without sin." And like the expiatory victim, He "bore our sins," and took them away; fulfilling in a remarkable manner and in full detail the rite that was followed in the greatest of the sin offerings on the Day of Atonement; for He combined in His own Person the parts of the two goats: in the first, giving His life as a sin offering, in the second, the scapegoat, "bearing all their iniquities into a land not inhabited." The literal meaning is "a place cut off," or as in the margin, "a place of separation," implying the complete removal of the sin, so that it should be known no more.

The scapegoat is the translation of a Hebrew word Azazel—not found elsewhere in the Old Testament;

[1] 2 Cor. v. 21. [2] Gal. iii. 13.

but it was the name of a demon according to Jewish and Mohammedan traditions. Another rendering then of Leviticus xvi. 8, "And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats; one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat," would be, instead of "for the scapegoat," "for the evil one," *i.e.* to send back the sins expiated to Satan, their author.

In the third action, the slaying of the victim, our Lord did not actually shed His own blood, which was the law of the offerer, but He asserted, and that several times, that it was only allowed by others because He refused to stay their hands: "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to My Father, and He shall presently give Me more than twelve legions of angels,"[1] *i.e.* to protect Me? And again, "No man taketh it (My life) from Me, but I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again."[2]

The fourth was the first distinctly Priestly act, the pleading the efficacy of the Blood of His Sacrifice to take away sin. This He did when, like the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, He took the Blood of the Victim and pleaded by it to the Father for the forgive-

[1] S. Matt. xxvi. 53. [2] S. John x. 18.

ness of the sins of the world. "For," it is written, "Christ is not entered into the holy place, made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us."[1] And again, "By His own Blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us."[2] The only difference in the pleading is that one was momentary; the Jewish High Priest's sacrifice, being imperfect, had to be renewed; but because Christ was the perfect Antitype of all sin offerings, His has no need to be repeated, only to be continuously pleaded, till His Mediatorial Kingdom ceases at the end of the world.

The last act was the Feast upon the Sacrifice, begun by anticipation at the Last Supper, when He gave His Body to be eaten, just as the priest had so often given the body of the victim, after it was sacrificially slain, to be partaken of by the offerer, in token of communion with God. This was the final consummation of the Sacrifice. Thus Christ fulfilled all righteousness: all to which the typical sacrifices had pointed.

[1] Ep. to Heb. ix. 24. [2] *Id.* v. 12.

CHAPTER IV.

Sacrificial Worship Continued down to the Present Time.

NOW if, as we have shewn, many of the characteristics of Jewish Worship were continued in the Christian Church, it becomes a matter of the deepest interest to discover how far the most important of all, that which was the very sum and centre of the whole system, was passed on and preserved.

If the declaration of S. Peter, that "prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," included this as one of the principles for which Divine Revelation was needed, then there can be no doubt whatever of the Divine purpose, that Sacrificial Worship should be perpetuated.

The prophets, several hundred years before Christ, had predicted it. Jeremiah,[1] as he looked into the

[1] xxxiii. 18, 21.

future, when the Gentiles should be brought into the Church, said, "Neither shall the priests the Levites[1] want a man before Me to offer burnt offerings and to kindle meat offerings and to do sacrifice continually." Yet, further, he established its permanence by an emphatic figure, placing it on a level with the orderly succession of day and night in the natural world; saying, in the Name of the Lord, "if ye can break My covenant of the day and My covenant of the night in their seasons; then may also My covenant be broken . . . . with the Levites, the priests, My ministers."

The latest prophet, Malachi, also makes the following predictions: "From the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, My Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My Name and a pure offering."[2] And again, "He shall sit as a refiner

[1] In S. Clement *ad Cor.* 1, 40, the very title "Levites" is applied to Deacons in the Christian Church. S. Ambrose, *de officiis Ministrorum*, writes, "Learn, O priest and Levite, what it is to wash thy robes, that thou mayest present a clean body for the Celebration of the Sacraments."

[2] Mal. i. 11; iii. 3, 4.

and purifier of silver; and He shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering of righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the days of old and as in former years."[1]

The prophecies are in no way discredited, because the exact imagery of the language is not reproduced in the fulfilment; for we shall see how the principle or spirit of the special sacrifices has been preserved, no longer separately, but all combined in "the Memorial before God." These passages have been so generally interpreted by the Early Fathers and others, as referring to the Eucharistic Sacrifice that the learned Mede said the only possible way of accounting for this unanimity was, that they had learnt so to apply them by tradition from the Apostles, who had been taught by Christ Himself. He further supports this conviction by illustrations of the names given to the Eucharist in early times, "Oblation, sacrifice, sacrifice of thanksgiving, sacrifice of praise, reasonable and unbloody sacrifice, sacrifice of the Altar, sacrifice of our Ransom, sacrifice of the Body and Blood of

[1] *Id.* iii. 3, 4.

Christ:" and he adds that "it would be infinite to note all the places and authors where and by whom it was thus called."[1]

Now when Christ, as the Antitype, was about to consummate all the typical sacrifices in His own great Sacrifice on the Cross, He instituted a Service for the express purpose of commemorating this and providing for the application of its saving efficacy to the souls of men.[2] It seems only natural, then, that we should find in this Memorial some corresponding features -something to recall it both to God and man. Thus it has been well said, by the Evangelical Author of "*Church Doctrine Bible Truth*," "it was instituted at a sacrificial time, for a sacrificial purpose and in sacrificial terms."

Let us, then, examine this threefold declaration. The time—it was the Passover. "Christ our Pass-

[1] Mede, *Christian Sacrifice*, 355.

[2] Bramhall bears testimony to the Eucharist being more than a commemorative Sacrifice, a designation which is largely accepted as summing up its whole significance; and he describes it "as an applicative Sacrifice, or an application of His merits to our souls" It is this which gives us the most valued estimate of it as being in a sense propitiatory. *Works*, i. 3, 255. Cosin's *Notes* in his works, v. 106.

over is sacrificed for us, therefore let us keep the Feast."[1]

The purpose — it was for the continued fulfilment of the fourth ritual action in the Sin offering, viz., the sacrificial pleading before the Father of the efficacy of the blood which had been shed in sacrifice: and secondly, to carry out the Fifth, for the Feast upon the Sacrifice, even the participation of the Body and Blood of Christ.

In sacrificial terms—we can hardly understand these from the English translation made so familiar by long usage. There is nothing necessarily sacrificial in the words "do this in remembrance of Me:" but the Greek term which our Lord used for "remembrance" had never been understood in any other sense in the Greek of the Scriptures. It is there restricted to a "memorial *before God;*"[2] to something which would appeal to the Father, as for instance the sacrifice of Peace offering or the frankincense upon the Shew Bread; there is no example of its being applied to any act or thing intended merely to quicken *men's* remembrance.[3] To interpret it, therefore, only as

[1] 1 Cor. v. 7. [2] ἀνάμνησις, in Numb. x. 10. Levit. xxiv. 7.

[3] This is translated in the Septuagint, by μνημόσυνον, *e.g.* Numb. xvi. 39, 40. Josh. iv. 7.

reminding men of Christ's Death is to divert it from its traditional usage.

The word translated "do," in "do this," is not so restricted, but has nevertheless a sacrificial application about fifty times in the Septuagint of the Old Testament; *e.g.* to celebrate, to keep (a festival), to offer, to sacrifice.

Inasmuch, then, as one of the words used by Christ *must* be sacrificial, it seems natural to interpret the other 'remembrance,' which is associated with it, in a similar sense. The right translation, therefore, we believe to be, "celebrate" or "offer this as My Memorial;" and we have in support the authority of the Primitive Church, which would be familiar with the language in which He spoke.

Before, however, passing from the Scripture evidence it will be well to notice two passages, one in the Revelation, and one in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the latter of which the Early Fathers interpreted with singular unanimity, implying a continuity of sacrificial doctrine, and the former even more markedly so, at least in the Eastern Church.

The Book of Revelation, clothed as it is in most mystical language, cannot be interpreted as

indisputably lending Divine sanction herein to the sacrificial character of the Worship of the Church; but there is one part which was largely understood in this sense in primitive times, and by the Eastern Church which has arranged its ritual worship after this model down to the present time.

The belief is that as God had given a special revelation of Jewish Worship to Moses, "according to the pattern in the mount," so He unveiled to S. John the outline of Christian Worship, as he was "in the Spirit on the Lord's Day" in the Isle of Patmos. It is unfolded in the fourth and fifth chapters, in which the central object of the vision is this: "In the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain." Nothing could represent the mystery of Christ's Sacrifice and continued Intercession more vividly than to speak of Him as the Victim "slain" and the Priest "standing"; for the Church has been wont to teach that "in every Eucharist Christ is both Priest and Victim." There are too some striking coincidences between the description and the Church's practice, viz., in the placing on the Altar, in the Lesser Entrance, the Four Gospels here symbolised

by the Four Living Creatures "in the midst of the throne;" and again in the accompanying anthem, "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty," the usage of which can be traced through all the history of Eucharistic Worship.

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in speaking of the Jewish sacrifices in their relationship to the Gospel Dispensation, and of both to the reality, as it will hereafter be disclosed, makes use of a most suggestive figure; "The Law having a shadow of good things to come and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect."[1]

It is as when we go into an artist's studio and see on the easel the rough outline of a portrait he is beginning to paint, or of some scene which is taking shape in his brain. All the important features are roughly indicated, the complexion of the face, the colour of the eyes, the tone of the dress; or if it be a landscape, mountain and valley, sunshine and shadow, in balanced proportion. That is the shadow or sketch; the Law as it was at the first.

[1] Heb. x. i.

Then after a time we revisit the studio, and the canvas has all its lines and salient points deepened, and what was before only indicative is conspicuously clear, and instinct with life and interest. That is the image or picture ; the development of the Gospel.

Then we return once more, but go away disappointed ; because with our finite capacities we cannot take in the ideal, for as yet "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man to conceive"[1] the reality, as it is in Heaven. Some such figure as this must have been in the mind of S. Ambrose and others,[2] when they wrote their threefold description of the two Revelations of God that have been, and of the final Apocalypse to be disclosed, when "we shall see even as we are seen."

There is a perfect catena of passages running through the writings of the Early Fathers from Irenæus to S. Leo and onward, all testifying to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and in unmistakable

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 9.

[2] Bishop Wordsworth *in loco* has quoted corresponding comments from S. Ambrose, the well-known Umbra in Lege; Imago in Evangelio; Veritas in Cœlo; so also S. Chrysostom, and Theophylact.

terms as the true, the proper, the holy, or the dread, or the mystic, or the fearful and tremendous Sacrifice. Indeed, it seems to be almost a waste of time to bring them into notice. Let one, however, be given as an example. S. Cyprian writes, "If Jesus Christ is Himself the Great High Priest of God the Father, and first offered Himself a Sacrifice to the Father, and commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, surely the priest truly acts in Christ's stead, who imitates that which Christ did; and he then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he begins to offer it according as he sees Christ Himself offered it."[1]

The witness of the Primitive Liturgies is even more abundant; though from the recognised fact that they contain many interpolations of later date, attempts have been made to depreciate their value, yet on the two points upon which we here appeal to their authority, there can be little doubt. If the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice or the habit of praying for the faithful dead had not been generally accepted before the age in which they

[1] Epist. lxiii. *ad Cæcil.*

were composed, we should have looked with suspicion on those passages which provided for their recognition in Public Worship. Church History shows that doctrines and practices do not find expression in the Service-books till they have taken root in the hearts and affections of the people. In confirmation of such a subject as we are now considering contemporary evidence enables us to appeal to them with confidence; and in the oldest families or groups, in which Primitive Liturgies have been classified by scholars, sacrificial terms are as common as in Patristic literature.

Here is a specimen from the Liturgy of S. Clement.[1] At the Consecration, the Celebrant says, "Wherefore having in remembrance His Passion . . . . we offer to Thee, our King and our God, according to this institution, this bread and this cup, giving thanks to Thee through Him that Thou hast thought us worthy to stand before Thee and to sacrifice unto

[1] This is accounted the oldest, being found in the VIIIth Book of the Apostolic Constitutions under the name of S. Clement, but in the text itself it is ascribed to S. James. It is considered, whoever was the Author, to give the Form of Liturgy in use at the beginning of the fourth century.

Thee. And we beseech Thee, that Thou wilt look graciously on these gifts now lying before Thee . . . . and send down Thy Holy Spirit on this Sacrifice, that He may make this bread the Body of Thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of Thy Christ."[1]

In the Liturgy of S. James, again, "we offer to Thee this tremendous and unbloody Sacrifice, beseeching Thee that Thou wouldst not deal with us after our sins, nor reward us according to our iniquities."

And so we might illustrate the principle from many others, if it were necessary; but save by those who object on the ground of the uncertainty of the text, this branch of the evidence is universally accepted.

[1] When this Invocation of the Holy Spirit was introduced into the First Prayer Book of Edw. VI. it seemed to Bucer and others of like mind to teach Transubstantiation, but there is nothing said about changing *the substances* of bread and wine. In the normal Form, found in the Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, it was . . . . "Make this bread the precious Body of Thy Christ, &c. Amen. Changing them by Thy Holy Spirit." Taking the lowest view; if the Elements are to convey to the receiver the Body of Christ, they must become in some sense different from what they were before.

Indeed there is so little doubt about the recognition of the doctrine in the period when these Liturgies were in common use, or during the mediæval age when they were largely developed, that I pass to the great upheaval in worship which came upon the Church of England in the sixteenth century.

No fault can be found touching the Sacrifice of the Eucharist in the First Prayer Book of Edward VI. The Revision was carried out entirely by English divines,[1] who had been carefully chosen to inspire the country with confidence from their representative character as best fitted, while correcting abuses, to preserve the Catholic Faith; and when we examine impartially the result of their labours in regard to the Holy Eucharist, we are able to commend them for their maintenance of the two great principles under consideration that were established in the Primitive Church.

They gave fuller recognition to the aspect of Communion which had unquestionably been obscured and neglected in mediæval times, especially by the

[1] A full description of their qualifications may be found in the Author's *Studies of the Prayer Book*, under the heading of "The Anglican Reform."

frequency of solitary Masses in which the priest alone communicated; but while doing this, they were extremely careful to avoid bringing the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice into discredit.

The very title of the Office combined their double purpose. It was "The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, commonly called the Mass." The Celebrant was a priest; that on which the Oblation was laid was an Altar; and for more definite teaching, it was said that "Jesus Christ commanded us to celebrate with His holy gifts," the Memorial "which He willed us to make, having in remembrance His blessed Passion;" and it embodied in "the Prayer of Oblation" an exact description of the three typical sacrifices: "mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," a title associated again and again in Leviticus with the peace offering; "to grant that by the merits and death of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and all Thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion," which takes us back at once to the sin offering of the Day of Atonement, made by the transgressor, and its blood pleaded for the forgiveness of the sins of all by the High

Priest, the whole congregation joining in the intercession by virtue of their lay-priesthood; and, thirdly, the burnt offering, described in the very language which a Jew would have used: "here we offer and present unto Thee ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice."

So far all that was primitive and essential was preserved; but three years later great changes were introduced, owing to the interposition of Anti-Catholic Reformers from the Continent. Foremost among these were Calvin, Melancthon, John à Lasco, Bucer, and Peter Martyr.

The study of their lives and doctrines has forced upon us the conviction that their object was, as far as possible, to eradicate Catholic doctrine.

But save in one particular they only indirectly, though very seriously, traversed the sacrificial doctrine. They omitted a prayer that those who partook of the Sacrifice might be worthy to receive the most precious Body and Blood; and they made no reference to the Body and Blood of Christ in the words of administration.

There can hardly be a question that they would gladly have carried out their principles; and though

in the minds of some they went perilously near to obliterating the Sacrificial aspect, yet inasmuch as probably through ignorance of its liturgical significance, they left in "the Prayer of Oblation" the application of the three great typical Jewish sacrifices to the Christian Service, the result of their revision did no more than overshadow it. Probably they were led to disregard the sacrificial language by the expression as applied to the Eucharist, "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving," interpreting it in a sense which they would not care to deny, viz., that the sacrifice consisted in the offering of praise and thanksgiving. They would remember also its use in this sense in the Epistle to the Hebrews.[1] "By Him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to His name." If it had occurred by itself in the Prayer, they would have been justified in their interpretation, but it is placed in the same category with two other Jewish sacrifices which suggests at once to anyone who is familiar with the system, quite another interpretation, viz., that of a material sacrifice, even the peace offering,

[1] xiii. 15.

which was made together with an oblation of loaves of leavened bread, presented unto the Lord—an addition "entirely without parallel in the whole range of sacrifices." Further, the loaves were consumed by the worshippers, and "were called traditionally by the name of "Bread of Thanksgiving," "a wonderful provision for the growth of the Eucharist out of this Rite."[1] In the light of this there can hardly be a doubt in what sense the phrase in "the Prayer of Oblation" was originally intended.

The mind of the Foreign Reformers had not been cast in a liturgical mould; and it is probably owing to this that in the Providence of God the primitive doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, even at the most revolutionary epoch, was not left without this witness.

It is moreover some consolation to have the testimony of the Statute which gave legal force to their Revision, and greatly minimised its supposed effect by asserting that the First Prayer Book which they had altered, in which the Sacrificial aspect of the Holy Eucharist was emphasised, was "a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the Primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people

[1] *Cf.* Freeman, *Principles of Divine Service*, ii. 272.

desiring to live in Christian conversation and most profitable to the estate of this realm."[1]

Lastly we have in the Preface to our present Prayer Book the strongest testimony in favour of the contention of this Address, viz., that the principle of Eucharistic Sacrifice was passed on from Jewish to Christian worship, and through all the changes of many centuries and the reaction of the Reformation, has never been abandoned. The language is plain and unhesitating; "We find that in the reigns of several Princes of blessed memory since the Reformation, the Church, upon just and weighty considerations her thereunto moving, hath yielded to make such alterations in some particulars, as in their respective times were thought convenient; yet so, as that the main body and essentials of it, as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof, have still continued the same until this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken."

The value of this testimony it is impossible to exaggerate, and one of the most Catholic-minded Bishops[2] of the last century, asserted in his Primary

[1] *Cf.* Collier v. 464.

[2] Bishop Woodford, of Ely.

Charge, that it lay in the fact that it was "the assertion not of individual theologians, but the deliberate pronouncement of the Church speaking for herself."

CHAPTER V.

Answers to Popular Objections, especially that this Continuity was broken at the Reformation.

MANY and violent attacks have been made upon the Catholic principles of our Church during the present generation, especially as touching the doctrine of the Priesthood; and it is hoped that some reply to the chief arguments may be found useful both for the Clergy and laity.

These attacks have come from two opposite quarters; made on the one side by Churchmen, who firmly believe in the continuity of Jewish and Christian Worship, but insist that this was broken at the Reformation in the Church of England, through certain changes in her Episcopal consecrations, by which she forfeited all Catholic claim to an Apostolical succession. On the other side, objections are raised by a certain section, who reject

all idea of the above continuity, and anything in the nature of a true and proper sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist or the exercise of priestly functions in the Ministry of Christ's Church.

A few years ago[1] Pope Leo XIII. took an extreme line, and issued a Papal Bull concerning Anglican Orders, denouncing their validity on the ground that "whatever sets forth the dignity and office of the Priesthood had been deliberately removed" from our Ordinal. Anglican priests, therefore, had no commission "to offer sacrifice," which is the chief function of the Order.

The Archbishops of England[2] took up the challenge, and replied to the Papal Strictures in a remarkably able historic examination of the question, proving that nothing essential had been removed at the Revision of the Anglican Ordinal in 1550, only later additions, unknown in the Primitive Church; and

[1] In 1896.

[2] Archbps. Temple of Canterbury and Maclagan of York. Their Answer was sent in Feb., 1897. Published both in Latin and English. It created no little stir amongst the Low Church Party, but the strength of our Rulers' arguments, added to their recognised absence of sympathy with the Extremists, carried wide conviction with it.

further showing that, if in the absence of certain rites of later introduction our Orders are invalidated, the same conclusion holds of necessity for those who were ordained by the Roman Ordinal, before those rites or ceremonies were used.

What the Pope impugned was our form and intention, because in ordaining a presbyter nothing was said about priesthood or sacrifice, and in consecrating a Bishop nothing of high-priesthood, which in some way ought to be attributed to him. But the Archbishops answered, "Both of these opinions are strange, inasmuch as in the most ancient Roman formulary used, as it seems, at the beginning of the third century after Christ . . . nothing is said about 'high-priesthood' or 'priesthood,' nor about the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ."

Again they refer to the old Roman Sacramentary, to be assigned, perhaps, to the sixth century, in which there were only three Collects, "which made up the whole rite for ordination in the Church of Rome till the ninth, in none of which is anything said of sacrifice or the remission of sins." And they show that "all the rest of the matter in the

Pontifical is derived from the usage of later times, and especially from Gallican rites." [1]

The formal pronouncement of the Archbishops is summed up as follows: "We truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice and do not believe it (as is implied) to be 'a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross;' but we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist—while lifting up our hearts to the Lord and when consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us[2] the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the Service. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious Death of Christ, Who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until His coming again. First we offer the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and re-present before the Father the Sacrifice of the

[1] *Cf.* Reply, xi., xii., xiii.

[2] The *nobis*, does not imply what is called a Subjective Presence, *i.e.* in the heart of the receiver, but it is a *dativus commodi*, *i.e.* for our benefit, and it is consistent with the Objective Presence, and was the same in the Roman Canon.

Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the Sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things, which we have already signified by the oblation of His creatures. This whole action we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic Sacrifice."

This establishes on the highest and most trustworthy evidence of these later times the principles maintained in the preceding Address; and we are thankful for the attack that was made, because the defence it called forth was such as to encourage to an almost surprising extent not a few Churchmen, whose faith had been unsettled before.

But the objections, which are being pressed with much urgency at the present juncture, come from Churchmen, who prefer to be called Protestant rather than Catholic, many of whom admit that though the Church of England, in common with the Church Universal, in primitive and later times may have accepted views of Priesthood and Sacrifice, such as we have set forth, nevertheless renounced them completely at the Reformation as unscriptural and misleading.

For instance, nothing is more common than to hear it asserted that, when our Lord cried on the Cross "It is finished," the whole Sacrificial system closed. Christ was on the point of dying a Sacrificial Death, that to which all the typical sacrifices looked forward; it is not surprising, therefore, that from lack of understanding, those who imagine that the sacrifice was consummated in the death of the victim, should conclude that all was "finished."

We are saved not alone because Christ died as an All-sufficient Sacrifice for our sins, but because "He ever liveth to make intercession" for us; and that High-priestly intercession will never be over, but be continued by Himself in heaven, and by His representative priests on earth, as we shall see, till He comes out from the Presence of the Father, and shall resign His Mediatorial kingdom.

A study of the Jewish System, especially of the successive ritual actions by which a sacrifice was completed, reveals the almost startling fact, that as yet, Christ had exercised no priestly function, had made no provision that the Sacrifice of Himself should atone for the sins of the world. There was nothing priestly in surrendering Himself to His

executioners; nothing priestly in taking upon Himself vicariously the sins of men; nothing priestly in laying down His life; nothing, in short, till like the High Priest on the Day of Atonement, He should take the Blood of the Sacrifice and plead its efficacy before the Father. This was the primary and all important function of the Priestly office; and, as the Antitype of all, His work would have failed without it. It was thus, and thus alone, that He could secure eternal redemption for us in God's appointed way, as the High Priest of the world; thus that He discharged in its entirety the law of Sacrifice, and "fulfilled all righteousness."

What, it would seem, if we may reverently conjecture, Christ meant when He said, "It is finished," was that all that His self-sacrifice had entailed, with its attendant Passion, all the cruelty of the executioners and the mockery of the bye-standers, all the sufferings known and unknown, which had brought Him to the very point of death, were over and past.

There is another objection, not often raised in a factious spirit, but based upon a conscientious conviction; it is the fear lest the admission that

there is anything sacrificial in the Eucharist, should seem to deny, or at all events seriously to traverse, the All-sufficiency of the Atonement. If this were well-grounded, we feel that the Church would have so qualified its belief as to exclude the possibility, but there has been no wavering. It has insisted on the fact that it is a Sacrifice; and at different times special aspects of it have been brought into prominence, partial descriptions have been given, as for instance, it has been called "commemorative," or "representative," or "impetrative," or "applicative," all in relation to Christ's sacrifice; but the Church has never attempted to do more by a conciliar or authoritative definition.[1]

The treatment of the subject has been akin to that of the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament as we have received it, viz., as an undoubted fact but shrouded in mystery and inexplicable to finite intelligence.

Now let us see what is the teaching of Scripture

[1] At the Council of Trent it was defined as "a true and proper Sacrifice," verum et proprium sacrificium, but no explanation of its complete relationship to the Atonement was given.

from the analogy of Jewish Sacrifice and from direct statements in the New Testament.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews it is said, "Christ offered one Sacrifice for sins for ever." It is clear therefore that there can be no repetition of an atoning Sacrifice. The Prayer of Consecration in the Eucharist exactly echoes this: He "made there (by His one oblation of Himself once offered) a full perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

Herein, Christ, Who as a Priest must now have something to offer,[1] shows Himself the Antitype of the Jewish High Priests in their action on the Day of Atonement. The Sacrifice they offered year by year did not in itself take away the sins of the Jewish nation, only when the blood was pleaded by them before the Father. Even so the Sacrifice of the Cross did not by Christ's Death, *ipso facto*, take away the sins of mankind, for there was the same necessity to plead this and in the same way, and it was not complete or efficacious till this had been done.

It is not said Christ *was* the propitiation for our sins, but *is* the propitiation. Neither are we told

[1] Ep. to the Heb. viii. 3.

that by His Sacrifice He *took* away sin, but *taketh* it away; and this implies that the sacrificial act is continuous, and is made efficacious by His Priestly intercession in heaven, for which He "ever liveth," and with the co-operation of men on earth, as His representatives, by the means Divinely appointed for the purpose — their act, as His own, being "a memorial before God" and therefore sacrificial.

The doctrine, then, of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, so far from lowering our estimate of the Atonement is necessary, when the analogy is fully considered, to enable us to see how its virtue is applied to individual souls.

Take now another objection, which calls for refutation, if only for the support which it has received in high quarters.

"In the Christian Church there is no sacrificing priest." Now what is meant? Some, at any rate, having in their mind the priest of the Old Dispensation are under the mistaken idea that his chief function was to slay the victim; indeed, this supposition is wide-spread.

To give one illustration from the late Dean Stanley, whose lectures at Oxford attracted so much attention,

especially among candidates for Holy Orders.[1] In his exposition of the nature of the Jewish priesthood, he asserted that moral and intellectual qualifications were of only secondary importance. What was first needed was "the robust frame . . . . the quick eye, and ready arm, which could strike the fatal blow"; and again, "Butcher and Priest," he said, "are now the two extremes of the social scale. A fine moral lesson is involved in the fact that they were once almost identical!"

There are surely many direct contradictions to the startling statement that "moral and intellectual qualifications were of secondary importance" in the writings of the Prophets. What for instance could be stronger than Malachi's testimony, "The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth: for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts?"[2] And herein he was only echoing God's first directions to Aaron and his sons, "That ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses."[3]

[1] *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, Second Series, pp. 411-413.

[2] Malachi ii. 7. [3] Levit. x. 11.

And as to moral qualifications, do not the inspired denunciations on the false priests show that they had fallen away from the standard required of them before they were admitted to the sacred office?

But apart from the above erroneous conception, there is great unfairness in taking an occasional and rare case when the priest slew the victim, and speaking of it as his normal function Ezekiel makes this quite clear by showing how certain priests were degraded from their office because they had fallen away to worship idols, and as a punishment were ordered "to slay the burnt offering and sacrifice for the people," but not to "come near unto Me, to do the office of a priest unto Me"[1]

Further, if it be necessary to give additional proof, we have it in the practical impossibility of the priests going through the physical labour it would entail, when, as at the Passover, so many victims had to be slain. It has been calculated that they numbered at an ordinary Paschal Feast, no less than sixty thousand lambs. The order of proceedings was for the priests to arrange themselves in two lines, and as soon as the doors of the Temple were thrown

[1] Ezekiel xliv. 10-16.

open at three o'clock, when the time "between the evenings" began, the heads of the different families brought their lambs, each one with a knife tied to the horn or to its fleece, before the priest nearest to him, who at once bade him kill it. He then held out a bason to catch some drops of blood, which, when full, was passed up by the priests behind, and poured out at the foot of the Altar. After the lamb had been dressed, it was brought again to the priest, who pierced it with two spits in the form of a cross, and gave it back to be roasted. This is a very different picture to that which was drawn above. Except on the Day of Atonement, when the High Priest did offer the sacrifice for himself, not as a priest but as a sinner, if he is said to slay the victim, it is almost certain that it was not intended to be by his own hand, but by that of the Levites, whose special office it was to assist the priest. It was an obvious illustration of the recognised principle, *qui facit per alium facit per se.*

Bishop Colenso dealt with the subject of the priests' functions in the same way in trying to discredit the inspiration of the Book of Leviticus, and fell into exactly the same error as the Dean.

He drew an equally vivid but imaginary picture of the priest carrying on his shoulders morning and evening the carcase of the victim for a sin offering for the congregation from the central place of sacrifice to be burnt outside the camp—a distance of about two miles! Here, it is true, the mistake was a little more excusable, for the English version translates it thus—"The skin of the bullock and all his flesh, with his head, and his legs, and his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock *shall he carry forth.*"[1] But the Hebrew is nothing more nor less than "he shall cause to go forth." Even an elementary knowledge of the language one would have thought, might have suggested that it was not done by himself, but through the ministration of the Levites.

Reverting, however, to the slaying of the victim, we cannot but call attention to the fundamental principle of sacrifice, which was that the offerer, not the priest, should take its life.

It was his acknowledgment that his own life, for which it was the substitute, had been forfeited by his sin. The distinctive duty of the priest was to

[1] Levit. iv. 11, 12.

take some drops of the blood which "makes atonement for the soul" (A.V.), or "by reason of the life" (R.V.), and plead by it for the forgiveness of the offerer's sins.

Seeing now that there is no more shedding of blood, it is the office of the Christian Priest to celebrate "the Memorial of Christ's Sacrifice" offered once for all on the Cross, and to plead before God its All-sufficient merits.

There is another and perhaps much commoner objection raised, especially by lay Churchmen; it is that the only priesthood now acknowledged in the Christian Dispensation is that of the baptized. S. Peter[1] and S. John[2] spoke of these as "a royal," or "a holy priesthood," or as "priests unto God;" but they were quoting God's language to the Jews,[3] within whose general priesthood there was an inner circle of ministering priests with special functions, guarded from invasion by the rest, by the penalty of death. That the Apostles intended not a partial but a complete analogy is shown by S. Jude, who says that this very punishment was meted out to some, who in his time must have usurped what were

[1] 1 S. Peter ii. 5, 9. [2] Rev. i. 6. [3] Exodus xix. 6.

inalienable privileges of a special priesthood; for he said "they perished in the gainsaying of Core." [1]

But perhaps the most frequent and plausible argument against the Catholic doctrine is that "Christ is the only Priest in His Church," which is true, but not as men generally understand it. It is not realised that Christ was the Antitype of the priesthood both of Aaron and of Melchizedek. As the former He entered into the Presence of the Father "by His own Blood," to present to Him the Sacrifice of Himself, and though no words were spoken, no uttered intercession made, as none were uttered by the High Priest in the Holy of Holies, He has been constantly pleading its efficacy ever since for the sins of the world, for it is written, that "He ever liveth to make intercession for them!" [2] This was the crowning service of the Aaronic priesthood; and Christ continues it in heaven, and has commanded a human priesthood as His representatives to do the same on earth.

His fulfilment of the priesthood of Melchizedek was begun at the Institution of the Eucharist, when He took "Bread and Wine," such as Melchizedek

[1] Numbers xvi. S. Jude 11. [2] Ep. to Hebrews vii. 25.

had offered, declared them to be His Body and Blood, and gave them separately, signifying thereby that they were to be offered in memorial of His Death, by which they were separated. This priesthood Christ does not exercise in heaven. Only through the co-operation of a human priesthood on earth is it possible for Him to fulfil the prophecy that He should be "a Priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek,"[1] of whom the only recorded priestly oblation is that he brought forth bread and wine."[2]

The last objection to be noticed is the very common but unimportant one, that the word "Altar" disappeared from the Prayer Book at the Reformation, and "the Table," or "Lord's Table," were substituted for it.

There is no doubt that the intention was to give emphasis to the Communion aspect of the Eucharist; but it cannot be urged as a rejection of its sacrificial character, seeing that the Jews, in whose worship sacrifice was the dominant element, did not hesitate to speak of the Altar as a Table. Ezekiel,[3] in describing the ornaments of the Temple, writes:

[1] *Id.* vii. 17. [2] Genesis xiv. 18. [3] xli. 22.

"The altar of wood was three cubits high, and the length thereof two cubits," . . . . and in his vision he heard God saying unto him, "This is the table that is before the Lord." And again,[1] speaking of the priests, the Levites, the Lord said to him: "They shall enter into My sanctuary, and they shall come near to My table to minister unto Me." And Malachi[2] expresses the complaint of God against Israel thus: "Ye offer polluted bread upon Mine altar and ye say, Wherein have we polluted Thee? In that ye say, The Table of the Lord is contemptible." And again, ye say, "The Table of the Lord is polluted."

So we see that our belief or disbelief in the Eucharistic Sacrifice does not depend merely on the terms that are used in speaking of it. The title of priest does not, of necessity, connote sacrifice, for it may be only an abbreviation of "presbyter"; neither, if we designate the celebrant a "minister," do we deny that what he does is a sacrificial act.

Some of you will remember how forcibly the great German dramatist expressed this when he put into the mouth of Mephistopheles, the impersonation of

[1] xliv. 16. [2] Malachi i. 7, 12.

Satan, this instruction,[1] to be given to a theological student who came to him to be taught his profession:

MEPH. "I fear to lead you wrong—and I
Speak here with more of hesitation.
It is a dangerous vocation,
This same Theology: its ways
Are such a tangled serpent maze -
Such poison everywhere disguised—
And everywhere as medicine prized--
That which is which, or why 'tis so,
Few can conjecture—none can know.
The best thing that the case affords
Is—stick to some one doctor's words:
Maintain his doctrines out and out;
Admit no qualifying doubt;
But stick to words at any rate,
Their magic bids the temple gate
Of Certainty fly safely ope—
Words, words alone are your best hope.
STUDENT. But in each word must be a thought.
MEPH. There is, or so we may assume,
Not always found, nor always sought,
While words—mere words, supply its room.

[1] Goëthe's *Faust* (Dr. John Anster's translation). I have quoted this fully because it has been so often illustrated in theological disputes, and never, perhaps, with more unfortunate results than in those about the Christian Priesthood and Sacrifice.

Words answer well, when men enlist 'em,
In building up a favourite system;
With words men dogmatize, deceive;
With words dispute, on words believe;
And be the meaning much or little,
The Word can lose nor jot nor tittle."

There can be no doubt, unhappily, that the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice was overshadowed at the Reformation, but it is equally clear that it was never obliterated; and that, because it lay embedded in the very structure of the Service, which was laid down on the lines of the Primitive Liturgies. When the Protestants rose to power under Cromwell, they realised the futility of all that had been done by changing its phraseology; and they determined on the only radical course for accomplishing their end; they prohibited the use of the Prayer Book altogether under the severest pains and penalties.[1]

It was only then during the brief space of the Puritan Ascendency that the Church in this country forfeited the right to enjoy its historic heritage; and then, through oppression and violence from without, not through any authorized concession from within.

[1] Five pounds for the first offence, ten pounds for the second, imprisonment for the third.

VI.

Continuity in Non-Sacrificial Worship.

THE ninety fifth Psalm, "O come, let us sing," the *Venite*, as it is technically called, has an important bearing upon this subject. It was anciently called by the Jews an "orphan" Psalm, as being deprived of something which in their judgment it ought to have. No title or heading is prefixed[1] to it, to indicate its parentage or authorship, its history, or its Liturgical use. In the whole Psalter, there are thirty four such 'orphans," but in a considerable number of cases tradition furnished what was wanting, and its authority goes back at least to the time when the

[1] The question of the genuineness of these has been much disputed. If not from the pen of the Author, which is very unlikely, they are certainly of great antiquity. They are at times quite inconsistent with the facts of history—*e.g.* Ps. xxx.

Greek Version was made, perhaps two centuries before Christ. By this the ninety fifth was assigned to David, and in the Early Church it was supposed to gain confirmation from the Epistle to the Hebrews,[1] in which a portion of it was quoted as being "in David"; but this only meant that it was in the Psalter, for which "David" was regarded as a synonymous title, through the common belief that he composed most of it. This traditional authorship was accepted without challenge for many centuries; but in these times, when the knowledge of Hebrew increased, it was discovered that the phraseology of the Psalm differed from that of certain recognised Davidic Psalms; and the composition of it was brought down to about five centuries later. If we receive this conclusion arrived at by distinguished scholars, the Psalm becomes at once instinct with fresh interest in connexion with the history of Jewish Worship; for thus it may well have been the outburst of some pious and patriotic Jew after the order of release from the Babylonian Captivity had been signed by Cyrus, as it was about this epoch. For many years the grand

[1] iv. 7.

worship of the Temple had been hushed in silence. He must have been told of the magnificent ritual which had surrounded the sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving offered at its Altar, and all his pent-up enthusiasm and longing for the Courts of the Lord broke out in this soul-stirring summons to offer again the worship that was due to his Creator. His name has perished, but his utterance still lives, echoing down from the far-off ages through twenty-five centuries, the great trumpet call to sing the praises of Him, "Who is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever."

Now if this be the true origin of the Psalm, it would naturally be sung for the first time in Public Worship, when the Second Temple was dedicated; and the Jews will tell you that from time immemorial it has, as it were, been consecrated to something like its original purpose, for it has been taken out of its place in the Psalter, even from other Liturgical Psalms, and assigned a specially significant part as an "Invitatory" to most important Services.

Though first intended to be sung in the Temple, its use was transferred to the Synagogues, which sprang up at home in memory of the "little

sanctuaries," built by the exiles in Babylon. They were meant to supplement the Sacrificial Worship in the one only appointed place. In these this Psalm was made the prelude especially of the Friday Evening Service,[1] to attune the heart of the people to those songs of praise which marked the Sabbath Worship through the length and breadth of the land. From this time forward it formed a distinguishing feature in all non-sacrificial Worship, as enforcing those three principles of praise, prayer and instruction which in combination belonged to the Synagogue. The elements of praise and prayer, it is true, were not wanting in Temple Worship; for the former, the very spirit and motive of the burnt offering was a constant witness; while the latter was offered in the petitions which invariably followed the confession of the transgressor when he presented his sin offering; but there is no trace of the element of instruction in connexion with sacrifice. It was given by those who sat in the seat of Moses, *i.e.* by the prophets or scribes, but not by

[1] The Jewish day beginning after sunset, this was held late, and was accounted a Sabbath service. It always began with Psalm xcv.

priests or Levites as an integral part of the Temple Worship.

Now as far back as the records of Public Worship carry us in the Christian Church, the *Venite* has been used as in the Synagogue, though in a shorter form in the East than in the West. Before explaining its appropriateness, let me remind you in the light of its antiquity and usage, that it is the pride of the Catholic Church, that it has such a lengthened history; that through the Apostolical succession the ministry of the twentieth century is one with that of the first—that there is no broken link in the chain of her commission, but that the voice which sends forth Priests and Deacons at every Embertide is nothing less than the echo of that which on the Galilean hill bade the first Apostles, "go and preach the Gospel to every creature." Even so, though in a lesser degree of importance, it lends an element of stability as well as a delightful charm to her Forms of Praise and Prayer, to realise that, while some religious bodies of more modern times are adopting every variety in their modes of worship, the old historic Catholic Church is content to preserve one unchanging song, and finds a never-

failing freshness in that which is positively hoar with centuries of use.

Now let us show how this "Invitatory" Psalm embodies the triple call to worship: praise, prayer and instruction, and in this order of importance. "O come, let us sing unto the Lord." There is the call to praise, for music and especially singing were enlisted from the first in the Service of the Temple, which was built primarily to show forth the greatness of God. The recognition of the majesty of the Creator was the motive that inspired David and Solomon with the desire to make the House of the Lord "exceeding magnifical," that He might sit enthroned amid the praises of Israel; and, as a contribution to this end, one-fifth of the tribe of Levi found their occupation by course in the exercise of vocal and instrumental music for the Services of the Sanctuary.

"O come, let us fall down and kneel before the Lord our Maker." There is the bidding to prayer: and while we know that special Psalms of David were sung in the Synagogue, the well-known Shemoneh Esreh[1], or Eighteen Prayers, were so commonly used

[1] *Cf.* Freeman ii. 336, and *The Divine Liturgy*, p. 268.

that, when our Lord's disciples asked Him to give them a prayer for their own, He based it largely upon those which had been made familiar to their ears in Synagogue Worship, only "filling up" according to His declared intention,[1] one clause in the petition on forgiveness, the full comprehensiveness of which the Jew understood all too little. This is His development, "Forgive us our debts; as we forgive our debtors. For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you; but if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."[2]

"To-day, if ye will hear His voice, harden not your hearts." "If ye will hear"—there is another rendering of the Hebrew construction, amply supported by the best Lexicographers,[3] which completes the threefold appeal for the ideal worship. It is a

[1] A very characteristic Jewish prayer was added later, probably against the Christians, "Let there be no hope for those who leave the true faith. Let heretics, however many, perish in a moment."

[2] S. Matt. vi., 12, 14, 15.

[3] *Cf.* Fuerst, who interprets it as a wish, utinam, as in Psalm lxxxi. 9, cxxxix. 19, Proverbs xxiv. 11. *Cf.* Rosenmüller's *Scholia in loco.*

summons to listen to the instruction of the Most High; "O that ye would hear His voice to-day, that ye would harden not your hearts"!

The third element was provided for in two ways, by Lessons, taken from the Law and the Prophets,[1] and also by an exposition of these, to which there is allusion in the Acts of the Apostles. This was given frequently by one of the congregation at the invitation of the Rulers.[2] Instruction became so characteristic of Synagogue Worship, that "the seven-branched candlestick," the common symbol of illumination, was frequently adopted and carved as an emblem over the entrance. Indeed, in the ruins of Synagogues hitherto discovered, the only departure from this is in that of Tell Hûm.[3]

The continuity of the Synagogue Worship with that of the non-Sacrificial services throughout the history of the Church is very marked. At first the places of assembly were even called synagogues,

[1] The former called Parshioth, *i.e.* Sections; the latter Haftaroth, or dismissals, because the congregation broke up after the explanation of these.

[2] Acts xiii. 15.

[3] *Cf. Footprints of the Son of Man*, by the Author, i. 39.

at least in Palestine, though *ecclesia*,[1] which subsequently became so common, soon superseded it in heathen countries. S. James writes, "If there come into your 'assembly' a man with a gold ring," but it is rightly rendered in the Margin, your 'synagogue."[2] Again the Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews,[3] when clearly encouraging attendance on Church worship, bids his readers not to forsake "the assembling of ourselves together," but it is literally "assembling in synagogues."

The hours for service in the Synagogue were three, 9, 12, and 3 o'clock, based on the practice of David, who said, "Evening and morning and at noon will I pray, and cry aloud, and He shall hear my voice."[4]

They must have been adopted very early by Christians, for Tertullian called them "the Apostolic Hours;" but owing to the necessity of concealment in times of persecution, they were soon changed; and when worship was carried on in the Catacombs and dens and caves of the earth, it was only during the darkness of night or in the early morning.

[1] *Cf.* Trench's Synonyms of The New Testament.
[2] S. James ii. 2. [3] x. 25. [4] Psalm lv. 17.

The next development in non-Sacrificial worship was in the Monastic Houses, which rapidly sprang up; and the habit which had been necessitated by the exigency of the times was adopted for disciplinary exercise. The one striking feature that marked their worship was the paramount importance attached to what must always be regarded as its primary object, viz., the element of praise. As of old, it was most largely expressed by Psalmody, the monks reciting the whole Psalter daily.[1] S. Augustine said that this was "sung throughout the whole world;" and S. Jerome implies that for a time at least all else was forgotten: "outside the Psalms there was complete silence;" and S. Basil has frequent reference to the same.[2]

How far this was literally true we cannot tell, but at the beginning of the sixth century, the daily

[1] There is an interesting relic of this habit preserved in some of the Cathedrals. The Prebendaries or Canons having one or more Psalms assigned to them on their appointment, to be said, so that the whole Psalter may be recited daily by the Community. At Lincoln the headings from the Vulgate of the special Psalms for each are written over their stalls.

[2] Epist. *ad Neocæsar.* 63.

worship was organised again, after the confession of David, "seven times a day do I praise Thee because of Thy righteous judgments;"[1] and the rule of S. Benedict for "the Seven Canonical Hours," the largest element of which was praise, was generally used,[2] especially in the West. They are supposed to have been adopted because the particular hours commemorated different stages of our Lord's Passion. An Ancient Hymn has set this out as follows:

> "At Matins bound, at Prime reviled,
> Condemned to death at Terce,
> Nailed to the Cross at Sext, at Nones
> His bleeding side they pierce.
> They take Him down at Vespertide,
> In grave at Compline lay;
> He thenceforth bids His Church observe
> Her sevenfold Hours alway."

These "Hours," the Services of which, with slight alterations, were gathered into the Breviary, and continued in the Church of England in the Sarum

[1] S. Basil, the Founder of the Monastic System, urges this as the ground for the sevenfold Hours. Sermo i. *de instit Monachorum.* The Hours were seven, but the Services eight, Matins and Lauds counting as one Hour.

[2] About 515.

Use; but when the First Prayer-book of Edward VI. was compiled, then the three, Terce, Sext, and Nones, which, coming in the middle of the working day, had been little attended save in the Monasteries where worship was the chief occupation, were omitted altogether, and those that preceded them, Matins, Lauds, and Prime, were amalgamated in Matins, those that followed, Vespers and Compline, in Evensong. Here again, it is interesting to observe how, in addition to other parts of less importance, the keynote of each of the Hours was carefully preserved in both of them, a large portion being taken up with Psalmody as before.

Thus the principle of continuity was maintained, especially in the dominant element of praise; and it was the same three years later, even in the Revision so largely influenced by the Foreign Reformers. The only change they made in 1552, was not, it is true, doctrinal; but betrayed a characteristic disregard for ancient Liturgical usage. The *Cantate* was introduced as an alternative for the time-honoured *Magnificat* or Hymn of the Incarnation, and the *Deus misereatur* for the *Nunc dimittis*.[1] The *Venite*

[1] Psalm xcviii., "O sing unto the Lord," had no claim to

which placed the praise of God in the forefront, was left undisturbed.

This was a matter of great satisfaction, seeing that they interfered so seriously in the Eucharistic Service, eliminating the great Psalm of the Entrance, the Sequence, the loud Hosannahs, the Benedictus, and the thrice-repeated Agnus Dei.

Let our last thoughts, then, be spent in bringing out as strongly as we can this, the essential and fundamental ground for public worship, whether

be made an alternative. It put an Old Testament Canticle on a level with a New Testament one; and secondly, it allowed the *Magnificat*, which had enjoyed a special Liturgical prerogative from the beginning, to be superseded by a Psalm that was only used in its ordinary course. It was the same with the second Evensong Canticle. We have said nothing of the *Jubilate* as an alternative for the *Benedictus*, because this had had a special place in Lauds, being sung on Sundays as well as the *Benedictus*. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, when the composers ceased to set the *Benedictus* to music, in places where they sang it was rarely heard; but the Elisabethan musicians, like Tallis, Bird, and Gibbons, in honour of the Breviary to which they had been used, set the *Benedictus* by preference. Since the Catholic Revival in 1833, we have had musical settings for both, but the *Benedictus* rightly has precedence.

Sacrificial or non-Sacrificial, the recognition of God's claim upon us by reason of His greatness. The Psalmist realised that there is nothing calculated to fill the worshipper with the sense of this so much as the thought of Creation; and he expressed his instinctive conviction in the most forcible way in this call to worship, when he gave as the first reason why the creature should praise the Lord, the fact that "in His hand are all the corners of the earth; and the strength of the hills is His also." The striking antithesis of the original is completely lost in the Prayer-book Version, for the more correct rendering is, "in His hand are the deep places of the earth, and the height[1] of the hills is His also." Thus, we see, he selects just those two objects in Nature, mountain and valley, which most inspire man with a sense of his own littleness, and of the Creator's power and might. We have only to go into such a country as Switzerland and take our stand at the foot of one of the giant Alps, and gaze up at its towering summit, or to look down into such a gorge as the famous Via Mala,

[1] The Hebrew indicates not only heights, but such as are seen shining out from afar.

or the Schluct at Zermatt, or to walk through the bold ravines of Glen Lyon and Glencoe in Scotland, and we shall show ourselves dead to the best instinct of our being, if our thoughts do not rise at once to Him Who created those mighty forces which upheaved the mountains, and depressed the valleys and deep places of the earth. No lower motive, no ulterior motive can prompt the ideal worship. We may be filled with gratitude for what God gives us, or with fear of His vengeance, if we disobey His commands; but it is nothing in His eyes compared with the overpowering conviction that our first and highest duty is to throw ourselves prostrate in adoration before His footstool, because adoration is due to the unspeakable majesty of Him, by Whom the world was made.

There is a beautiful legend which will serve perhaps to fix this great principle in our minds. It matters little whether it be literally true, or, as so many mediæval legends, only intended albeit in a poetic and romantic form, to enforce an important truth. If we recognise this principle of interpreting them, so alien to the matter-of-fact generation in which we live, we shall generally be rewarded. We

are told in the biography of the devout and beautiful Spanish lady, Saint Theresa, that as she lay asleep, the vision of a strange and awful woman passed before her. In one hand she carried a pitcher of water, and in the other a pan of flaming coals. When the Saint asked in fear and trembling where she was going with that mysterious burden, she replied in startling tones, "I go to burn up heaven and to quench hell, and I wish to do it that henceforth men may learn to worship God, not from any hope of future reward in the one, not through fear of threatened punishment in the other, but simply for what God is, for Himself alone."

CHAPTER VII.

Eucharistic Intercession for the Departed a Natural Development in the Christian Church.

THAT Christ "ever liveth to make intercession" for us follows from the fact that He is our High Priest in heaven pleading before the Father the Sacrifice of the Atonement which He made on the Cross; and it is because the Eucharist is the earthly representation of this Sacrifice, that intercession has become an integral part of it. We shall best realise how this is, if we go back in imagination to the Day of Atonement. If we could have been present in the Temple, we should have seen the congregation of Israel on their knees filling the Outer Court, and, with eager anxiety, watching the High Priest as he passed through the Holy Place, bearing the Blood of the Sacrifice amid clouds of incense within the Veil, to plead its efficacy in expiation for the sins of the nation for a whole year.

S. Luke says of Zacharias, when he executed the Priest's Office: "The whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense."[1] This would be repeated on a far larger scale on the Day of Atonement.

They heard no sound of spoken words, but saw in the incense going up to God a vivid symbol of intercession, and they felt that not only the High-priestly pleading, but the prayers of the whole congregation, found their utterance in this.

In the Vision which S. John saw we are told that the incense represented "the prayers of the saints," and they were said to be offered on the Golden Altar, because it was from this that the incense was lit and ascended to God.[2] It was the same conception of its symbolism that made David compare his prayers with this same incense, as a thing signified with its sign: "Let my prayer be set before Thee as incense."[3] So Christ, of Whom the High Priest was a type, laying aside all shadows and symbols, now presents our prayers to God in reality; for as Origen answered Celsus, "We bring our prayers to

[1] *Cf.* S. Luke i. 10

[2] Rev. viii. 3; v. 8.

[3] Ps. cxli. 2

the God of the Universe through His only begotten Son, beseeching Him, Who is the propitiation for our sins, that as our High Priest He will present them to God over all."[1]

From the very beginning, then, of Christ's Church, the continuity of Jewish and Christian worship was preserved, and intercession knit up with the Holy Eucharist, which Christ Himself instituted to commemorate His Atoning Sacrifice. But there was one marked distinction in the persons for whom intercession was offered; and this arose from a wider view being taken of the extent and efficacy of the Atonement. In the typical sacrifice for sin the Jew thought only of the living; the antitype embraced the dead also. It was offered for the sins of all the world, past, present, and yet to come. So in that sacrifice, in and through which its saving grace is applied, all the whole Church may receive the benefits of Christ's Passion.

Herein we see another illustration of our Lord's promise, "I came not to destroy, but to fill up." The Jew restricted his prayer to the living, because

[1] *Contra Cels.* viii. p. 186. Ed. Cant. Outram, *de Sacrif.* cap. vi. iii.

of the vague conception which he had of the state after death, the knowledge of the future being possessed only by a few, and by them with no firm or consistent grasp. The Early Church, however, soon learnt the great truth that men only die as man accounts death; they are still "alive unto God," and so it considered that they were fit subjects for intercession. The Fathers, the Primitive Liturgies, and the Missal Litanies illustrate the belief again and again.

A few quotations from these sources of information will suffice as illustrations, for they are admittedly numerous. In Patristic Literature, Tertullian and Cyprian supply evidence from the third, S. Cyril and S. Augustine from the fourth centuries. Tertullian quite at the beginning writes, "We offer the oblations in behalf of the dead on the anniversary of their birth."[1] S. Cyprian a little later bears witness to the prevalence of the custom by telling how a certain Victor, who by his last will had violated the law of the Church, forfeited the privilege of having "the Sacrifice celebrated 'for the repose of his soul"[2]

[1] *De Corona Militis*, c. 3.

[2] Non offeretur pro eo nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur. Epist. i. *ad Presbyt. et Diac. Furnis.*

S. Cyril, in his Lectures on the Mysteries, says that the same was offered "for the holy fathers and bishops; in a word for all the rest who had fallen asleep among us"; he also says that, "the greatest benefit would accrue to their souls, if supplication was offered while the holy and most awful Sacrifice was being set forth."[1] S. Augustine further adds that it was a tradition coming down from the Fathers, and universally observed by the Church, "to intercede for the departed when they were commemorated in the proper place at the Sacrifice."[2]

From this we gather that the belief in the efficacy of such prayers had taken hold of the affections of the people at a very early period; and the knowledge of this prepares us for an abundant expression of it in the Primitive Liturgies.

From the Eastern Liturgies we quote the Clementine, "We offer to Thee also in behalf of all who have pleased Thee from the beginning of the world . . . and all whose names Thou Thyself knowest."[3] From the Western Sacramentaries we have the prayer

[1] *Cat. Myst.* v. [2] *Sermo* clxxii., *de Verbis Apostoli.*

[3] Apostol. Constit. VIII. 12. It contains a long list from patriarchs to virgins and laymen.

that "whatever stain the departed may have contracted in his passage through the world may be wiped out by these Sacrifices."[1]

Perhaps, however, the most interesting and definite testimony may be drawn from the use of certain Lists of names, which under a variety of designations were largely used at the Celebration. They were called "the holy tablets," or "mystic registers," or more commonly "diptychs," from having two folds or leaves. On one leaf were written the names of living persons, such as Kings, Bishops, and especially those who had brought oblations of Bread and Wine; on the other leaf were those of the Patron Saint or Founder, departed benefactors and others who in various ways had deserved well of the Church. These diptychs were kept near the Altar, and read out either by the Celebrant or an assisting deacon; and the prayers of the congregation were asked for in behalf the persons so named. This was done either before or after the Act of Consecration, though in the Gallican Liturgy, which largely influenced our own, it followed the oblation of the Elements.[2]

[1] Sacram. Leon. Muratori I. 451, and Sacr. Gelas, *id.* 747.

[2] By our present practice special intercessions are habitually

The Litanies of the Church were distinctly intercessory services; but at first for the most part processional out-of-doors, as we see in the Western Rogations. Their inherent appropriateness to the Holy Eucharist, however, soon became apparent, and under the title of "Missal" Litanies they were regarded as necessary in preparation for it.

Renaudot gives an interesting account of one of the Syrian Litanies, in the course of which the Celebrant takes the Paten and Chalice into his hands, and after commemorating the Passion, Crucifixion, and other events of the Incarnation, names certain persons who have departed, and then sets down the Elements on the Altar, and makes supplication for those who have asked for the Church's prayers in conjunction with them.[1]

If we pass over several centuries of the mediæval history, it is only because it is still the same, and is nowhere doubted. But it is necessary to test

asked in the same place, *i.e.* before "the Church Militant" Prayer. Till the Catholic Revival they were only asked for at Matins and Evensong, which was obviously wrong, both in principle and according to ancient usage.

[1] *Cf.* Ren. p. 16. Freeman, "Principles of Divine Service," Vol. ii. p. 325.

the validity of the oft-repeated assertion that, "though the practice may have been primitive and mediæval, it was deliberately rejected at the Reformation."

Before examining the passages which bear upon the subject in our present Prayer Book, I propose to see what evidence there is in the earlier Revisions in support of this contention. There is none, it is unnecessary to say, in that of 1549, but much of a most definite kind to uphold the primitive belief in its value and efficacy. Here is a quotation from the Order of Holy Communion; "We commend unto Thy mercy, O Lord, all other Thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy and everlasting peace, and that at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of Thy Son may altogether be set on His right hand and hear His most joyful voice: Come unto Me, O ye that be blessed of My Father, and possess the Kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world."

There is an echo of the same thrice repeated in the Burial Service: "Beseeching Thee that . . . both this our brother and we may be found acceptable in Thy sight, and receive the blessing . . . Come, ye blessed of My Father; receive the kingdom prepared for you before the beginning of the world." Again, "Grant unto this Thy servant . . . . that escaping the gates of hell and pains of eternal darkness, he may ever dwell in the region of light . . . and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just; set him on Thy right hand," &c.

Further, in the Celebration for which provision was made at the close of the Burial Service, there was a prayer that, "at the last day both we and this our brother departed, receiving again our bodies, may with all Thine elect saints obtain eternal joy"

Nothing can be plainer than this language; it bespoke the conviction of the leading English representatives of the Church, men who had been carefully chosen to draw up a Prayer Book which should embody the Catholic belief according to the standard of Primitive times, but purged where correction was necessary from mediæval excess and superstition.

If ever a Revision deserved the confidence of the Church of England at large, it was surely this alike in its inception, its process, and its results.

Convocation, the Church's great consultative Council, claimed the whole of the Revisers, either in its Upper or its Lower House. The interests of the Sovereign, then happily little affected by foreign and malign influence, were in the keeping of his attached subject, Archbishop Cranmer. Liturgical knowledge and general learning, so necessary for researches into the doctrines of an historic Church, found able exponents in men of high degrees from the Universities.

The different "Uses" for Public Worship in the Dioceses of York, Lincoln, Hereford, Bangor and "the Sarum Use," which was adopted for the most part in the rest, were all represented.

Neither must it be supposed that it was a one-sided Revision, for there were on the body not only staunch supporters of Catholic truth and practice, but divines who would not unwillingly have parted with much that was lawful, if the arguments in their favour had prevailed. Both sides had the courage of their opinions, and we have good reason

to believe that every disputed point was on the whole dispassionately weighed and settled.

Happy for the peace of our Church would it have been, if the result of their labours, as it was embodied in the first Prayer Book, had been left undisturbed for all time!

CHAPTER VIII.

Contemporary Evidence of its Preservation, though curtailed, under the stress and strain of the Sixteenth Century.

WE pass now to a critical epoch in the history of the Prayer Book. There is no doubt that under the influence of Calvin and other Foreign Reformers in 1552, great changes were made to the disparagement of Catholic doctrine and ancient usages. Among these changes the practice of praying for the departed was certainly discouraged, but it is important in view of any attempt to revive it, to discover whether the action of the authorities in the Church was regulated mainly by their view of what was expedient at the time, or was prompted by a desire to show their repudiation of it altogether.

If intercession for the departed was really inconsistent with the principles of the Church of England, we shall expect to find it not only omitted in the

Prayer Book, but also expressly condemned in the Articles of Belief, which were drawn up at this period "for the establishment of consent touching true religion." A body of these was issued in 1553, a year after the second Revision, but though it speaks in explicit condemnation of certain doctrines and practices that were deliberately rejected, it in no way censures the practice of praying for the dead. It is absolutely silent on the subject; but the silence, when the history is known, becomes a potent argument in its favour. At one stage in the process of their compilation "Prayer for the Dead" was included in the twenty-third Article in company with "The doctrine of School authors[1] concerning Purgatory, Pardons, worshipping, and adoration, as well of images as of reliques, and also Invocation of Saints as a thing vainly feigned, and grounded upon no warrant of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the Word of God."[2] There is no direct evidence by whom it was inserted, but

[1] In the XXIInd Art. of the XXXIX., which were issued nine years later, this is changed to "The Romish doctrine," etc.

[2] *Cf.* Hardwick's History of the Articles, p. 74.

there is a strong presumption that it was on the authority of the King, who was becoming year by year more averse from the Catholic Faith and practice, for it is known that the Articles were submitted for his approval in October, 1552, and the MS. of the document is still extant, bearing the signature of the six Royal Chaplains.[1] In support of this view we have the fact that in this year Bishop Hooper, of Gloucester, who was bitterly opposed to the practice, took upon himself to circulate the Articles with this clause throughout his Diocese. The said Chaplains must have assured him that it had the Royal assent. But before the Articles were publicly issued in the following year, this particular clause of the Article was erased, and the erasure was endorsed by Convocation. The fact, however, admits of no dispute, that the Church in her representative Council after full deliberation refused to condemn the practice, and that in face of incurring the Royal displeasure.

There are two or three other sources of evidence which, so far from being generally known, have

[1] Hardwick, *ibid.* p. 304, "Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, 1547-1580."

been rarely brought into consideration in the controversies upon the subject.[1]

The first of these is the publication of two editions of "a remarkable volume, which has scarcely received the attention it merits." This was a Primer reprinted in 1552 and twice in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. In this the Collects contain these petitions: "Grant, we beseech Thee, that in the coming of Thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, both we and all other faithful people being departed, may be graciously brought unto the joys everlasting"; and, "Lord, bow Thine ears unto our prayers . . . that Thou wilt bestow the souls of Thy servants, which Thou hast commanded to depart from this world, in the country of peace and rest, and cause them to be made partners with Thy holy servants."

Here, then, we have prayers for the departed deliberately retained and re-issued; and if it be

[1] They first came to my notice in a Review upon my book, entitled *After Death*, in the "Church Quarterly," in the April number of 1880, said to have been written by the present Bishop of Gloucester. They supply a valuable contribution in support of the above argument, that the practice was not rejected by the Church.

argued that they were only for use in private, at all events they were issued "with authority."

Another proof is taken from a source against which no such argument avails; it is that of the Latin Edition of the Prayer Book, issued by Royal Authority expressly granted under the Act of Uniformity to the King to take "further order in rites and ceremonies."[1] This contained a literal translation of the form touching the dead in the First Prayer Book from the Celebration at a Burial. It is deserving of weight that legal permission to use it was granted to the Universities, in which the future clergy, the representative teachers of Church doctrine, were being trained.

The last evidence on this point is not so direct, but not without weight. At the Savoy Conference, in 1661, the Puritan Divines prefaced their objections to the Order for the Burial of the Dead thus: "We desire it may be expressed in a Rubrick, that the prayers and exhortations here used are not for the benefit of the dead, but only for the instruction and comfort of the living."[2]

[1] *Cf.* Mr. Parker's *Letter to Lord Selborne*: and Cardwell's *Documentary Annals*, i. 297.

[2] Cardwell's *Conferences*, 333.

The Bishops in their Answers showed no sympathy with the desire, but passed it over in absolute silence as inconsistent with the recognised belief of the Church.

Seeing then that there is no indication to be found of the unlawfulness of the practice, we come to the examination of the changes with the conviction that the authorities in the Church accepted them because they had been so carefully worded that, though the language was much modified, quite enough was left to preserve the principle intact.

This conviction is based on contemporary evidence. Let me adduce three illustrations, one from the Burial Service, two from the Order of Holy Communion.

Bishop Cosin, who was the greatest Liturgical Scholar of the time and the leading compiler of our present Prayer Book, drew up a large body of critical and historical notes upon many of the changes in the different Revisions,[1] in which he combated Puritan interpretations which had been put upon them

Thus of the words . . . . "That we with this our brother may have our perfect consummation and

[1] *Cf.* Notes and Collections in an Interleaved Book of Common Prayer—Cosin's Works, Vol. V. Angl. Cath. Libr.

bliss, &c.," he writes:—"The Puritans think that here is prayer for the dead, allowed and practised by the Church of England, and so think I; but we are not both of one mind in censuring the Church for so doing." The Protestant objection to which he calls attention is very significant, as showing that it was understood at the time to be a distinct prayer for both, as much as if it had been written that "we *and* our brother," &c.

With this commentary we turn to the corresponding expression in the Prayer for the Church Militant in our present Service: "We bless Thy Holy Name for all Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and fear, beseeching Thee that with them we may be partakers of Thy heavenly kingdom"; on the analogy of the previous interpretation, this, too, is equivalent to "that we *and* they"—a distinct prayer for both alike.

There is no doubt that it was the similarity of meaning between these two modes of expression that led John Wesley to use them indiscriminately when dealing with the self-same subject. He tells us so.[1] In a Manual of Prayers which he wrote for his

[1] Second Letter to Bp. Lavington. Works, Vol. IX. 55.

communicants, and which continued in circulation for many years, he included several petitions for the departed, and he interchanged the forms "we with them" and "we and they" as equivalent.[1]

In the Second Prayer Book all such prayer was excluded from the General Prayer for the Church, not however, as is often supposed[2], because it was then headed "militant here in earth," but by the fact that it made no mention of the dead whatever!

At the final Revision this omission was rectified by adding the concluding clause as we now have it; and Bishop Cosin has shown us that it was so intended. It is quite possible that with his knowledge of ancient prayers, though being obliged to yield for expediency, he was content to leave the heading as it was, because of a very striking resemblance it bore to a pre-Reformation prayer, in which the bulk of its petitions were for the living, but which concluded, as this does in effect, with a distinct supplication for the dead. This was the

[1] It contains such prayers Morning or Evening for every day in the week; it passed through many Editions.

[2] I argued so in the *Divine Liturgy*, p. 180, but later study has changed my view.

title it bore: "A Generall and Devout Prayre for the Goode state of our Moder the Churche, Militant here on Erth."[1]

To give some idea of the resemblance in character we quote a few of the general objects prayed for, together with that with which it closes.

It appeals to the Almighty and Merciful God that He will "keep the Order of Bishops, Kings, and all principal persons, His servants and handmaids, in holiness and peace, and as well relations, kindred and friends, . . . that He will cleanse all Christians from sin and vice, remove out of the way enemies, seen and unseen, restore the sick to health, recover the fallen, relieve the oppressed . . . destroy all heresy and schism in the Catholic Church." . . . (and at the end) "grant to all faithful people, whether alive or dead, eternal life and rest in the land of the living."[2]

Now we pass to a third witness to the preserva-

[1] This is in a copy of the Hours printed in 1531. *Cf.* Blunt's Directorium Anglicanum. In his Annotated Prayer Book he quotes only a part, but I have examined the whole in the Latin, and given a summary of it in English.

[2] Et omnibus fidelibus vivis et defunctis in terra viventium vitam eternam pariter et requiem concedas.

tion of the principle, and that the most conclusive, not only because its very uncommon phraseology would otherwise be most perplexing, but chiefly because Bishop Cosin himself strongly confirms it.

Speaking of the clause in "the Prayer of Oblation," "That by the merits and death of Thy Son, Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, we and 'all Thy whole Church' may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion,"[1] he says, "This is a plain oblation of Christ's Death, once offered, and a representative sacrifice of it, for the sins of the whole Church, that both those which are here on earth and those that rest in the sleep of peace may find the effect and virtue of it." And he repeats the same later at great length, adding that Bishop Andrewes had grounded his answer to Cardinal Perron on this interpretation of the expression in the Prayer,[2] when he said, "We have and offer this sacrifice both for the living and the dead, as well for them that are absent, as those that be present." This he says he quotes from memory, but adds his

[1] For the relation to the Jewish Sin offering, *cf. supra* pp. 28-35.

[2] Works v. 119.

own opinion thus, "So that the virtue of this sacrifice (which is here in this prayer of oblation commemorated and represented) doth not only extend itself to the living and those that are present, but likewise to them that are absent and them that be already departed, or shall in time to come live and die in the faith of Christ."[1]

We have then in this, at the very time that the Oblations are lying on the Altar, an all-embracing intercession. It would lay a tremendous strain on our credulity to be asked to believe that this reference to the Jewish sacrifice was accidental or figurative only.

It was inserted in the First Prayer Book, and it was happily preserved as a safeguard of the principle through all the revisions that followed. Cosin and his colleagues coming to their work so shortly after the Protestant supremacy retained all that they could; and they have been careful to leave it on record for future guidance, that little as it was, it preserved the great principle of Eucharistic intercession for the departed. If I seem to have laboured this subject too much in detail, it is in view of repudiating by

[1] *Idem.* 352-3.

positive and historic disproof the unjustifiable charge that in teaching this doctrine and practice some of our most devoted Priests have been guilty of disloyalty to the principles of the Prayer Book.

We have shown that the language does admit the principle of praying for the departed, that it was adopted by the Reformers in the full knowledge that it did so, and that it was so interpreted, not only by those who wished for it, but by determined opponents of the practice.

Now it would indeed be deplorable if the results of the action of Revisers, who did all they could at the time in order to escape the possibility of disruption in the Church, should be stereotyped as final and unalterable.

One thing is clear, they never expected it to be so; but looked forward to the time when considerations of expediency would no longer have to be taken into account. That time, we believe, is drawing near. There is a strong desire abroad to revert to the teaching of the Primitive Church; and in this, that which is called in the Articles "the Romish doctrine of Purgatory" (which, with its popular associations of physical pains and torture filled the mind of

Calvin and Bucer with so much horror) had no support. This cannot, therefore, be regarded as a danger to be reckoned with in the present. Protestant agitators are busy with a contrary assertion, but they completely failed before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline to make good their charges.

Two quotations will enable us to discriminate between this, and what we believe to be purely Primitive. The Catechism of the Council of Trent asserted that "there is a Purgatorial *fire* where the souls of the righteous being tormented for a definite time are purified, that an entrance may be given them into their eternal home."[1] Further, in a treatise generally accepted as authoritative by members of the Roman Church, it is stated that "the pains of Purgatory are very severe, surpassing any endured in this life."[2]

Our real safeguard lies in the guidance of the Early Church, to which we are submitting ourselves more and more, which puts before us in the plainest terms a far different conception of the Intermediate

[1] *Cat. Trid.* pars. i. Art. v. § v.

[2] Bellarmine *de Purgatorio*, ii. 14.

State as a place of peace, and rest, and refreshment, and of progressive spiritual purification and fitness for the Vision of God; and for this the Church in her best estate has always prayed on behalf of those who have departed in the faith and fear of God.

CHAPTER IX.

Suggested Means for Regaining in greater fulness our Catholic Heritage.

SINCE the Catholic Revival began in 1833, the Church has recovered not a few neglected doctrines and practices, which bore the seal of Primitive recognition. In some cases, especially in the present generation, undue haste or impatience has retarded a full restoration, and thrown back that orderly progress and development of work and worship which best befits the Church of Christ. In our own time there is a widely-felt desire to re-establish a better relationship between the faithful departed and the Church on earth, such as existed for many generations and found adequate expression through the public Services. We are full of hope that we may win back at least as clear a public recognition of intercession for those who have died in the Faith, as was manifested in the Primitive Liturgies.

Two ways may be suggested for attaining this end. First, by trying to multiply anniversary services of Commemoration, especially for departed members of guilds, confraternities, and other religious communities, and by doing it with authority, *i.e.*, Episcopal sanction. If it is found to be a real and wide-spread want (and that it will be, if we of the clergy try to teach our people), unless we are greatly mistaken, few bishops will withhold the power that many are ready to concede as inherent in the Episcopate, by virtue of the *jus Liturgicum*, to sanction special services independently of the Act of Uniformity. The evidence given by a number of Bishops before the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline proves that they have found it impossible to maintain the cast-iron system of restrictions imposed under Queen Elizabeth, in face of the growing needs of an active Church. The Bishop of Gloucester, after considering a number of ceremonies not prescribed by Rubrical Order, the placing of Lights on the Altar, Mixing the Chalice, Bowing to the Altar and the like, sums up his conclusions in terms that point clearly to the exercise of some controlling authority if anything like order is to be

observed: "Facts show that every attempt to enforce the letter of the law universally has proved a complete failure and has ended disastrously for the Church." If this be so, and it can hardly be doubted, till the Act of Uniformity is repealed, the surest way to avoid a repetition of this history is, we believe, a frank recognition by priests and laity of such Episcopal authority as certainly was exercised in olden time, and has never been specifically taken away. It is at any rate historic, and most reasonable, though its strict legality may be open to dispute.[1]

There would be no distressing outcry of lawlessness and disloyalty if the Bishops saw their way to larger concessions, for purposes of course consistent with the principles of the Prayer Book; and if the Clergy manifested on their part a greater readiness to submit, whenever they possibly can, to the

[1] The following references in the Royal Commission Enquiry will illustrate it, *e.g.* Bishops of Salisbury, Southwark, Ely, and others acknowledge to having used it without claiming legal authority. *Cf.* Report, p. 10. On p. 62, it is shown that this authority in respect to special Services has been "loyally recognised, and the action of the Bishops met with a great measure of success."

counsels of their Spiritual Rulers. Is it not true that the conscience of the laity is far more shocked by the oft-repeated complaint that the Clergy disregard their oath of obedience, which they took at the most solemn moment of their lives, than by the mere introduction of new Services? The ordinary layman does not stay to examine the exact obligation of that particular promise, which, however, is far less stringent than he imagines. It is not absolute, but conditioned by conformity to the Law "of this Church and Realm." The Public Worship Regulation Act tried to impose a law on the authority of the Realm alone; and priests went to prison rather than violate their oath. The Act is now universally discredited, and priests will act wisely by accepting the Cyprianic rule to "do nothing without the Bishop." In 1898 a notable memorandum of High Churchmen declared it to be "the first principle of Catholicism." Since its issue troubles have largely diminished. Almost anything is preferable to seeing individual priests, claiming the right of private judgment, which history shows has wrought so much mischief in the Church, and which is certainly alien to the constitution and well-being of the Body of

Christ. We may not be able to get at once all we desire, but it must never be forgotten that the Church is the one body in the world that can best afford to wait.

At the present critical juncture it is suggested that a remedy may be found for removing grievances and obscurities of rubrical language in another way, which seems to many of us bristling with difficulty and fraught with peril. Is there no danger if, to satisfy the cravings of one's devout instincts, we ask Parliament, which is now showing itself anything but well-disposed to the Church, for bread that it may give us a stone or possibly a scorpion? Some, however, who are high in position and office, making, we fear, the wish father to the thought, are sanguine enough to hope that Parliament will pass a self-denying ordinance, and accept such proposals as Convocation may make for the restoration of discipline, without subjecting them to the criticism of the House. About thirty years ago there was a possibility of the experiment being tried, but it came to naught, owing to the determined opposition of a few trusted counsellors. Chief among them was Dr. Pusey, who wrote to me shortly before his death: "Any revision, I believe, would rend our com-

munion in two—our only hope, under God, is the bond of the Prayer Book as it is."[1] They are words to be weighed at this time even more carefully than when they were written. We have persevered for years in our belief that we have in the rubric all we require for the ornaments of the Church and ministers, and at last the claim has been practically and publicly vindicated.[2] We shall obtain the same liberty for additional services if by our loyalty and moderation we can convince our Fathers in God that they will supply a deep spiritual need. Already some of the Bishops have gladly exercised their right; the Bishop of London for example—in satisfying our heart's desire for a Requiem or Service for the Departed on several occasions, and for a Commemorative Service in the Metropolitan Cathedral, in all of which some of the petitions from the Primitive Liturgies were used; other Bishops in providing special Collects, Epistles,

[1] This letter is still in my possession.

[2] Among other utterances to this effect, I feel bound to refer to the relief created by the Bishop of Lichfield's explanation of the reasons given to the Royal Commission for not interfering with any of his Clergy who wore the Eucharistic Vestments: viz., that the rubric as it is with its statutory force must be altered before he could take action.

and Gospels for a Celebration on many Black Letter Days in the Calendar, and for other occasions. In Lichfield we have them authorized for about twenty such days, and also for Celebrations at a Marriage and at a Burial. These are printed regularly in the Diocesan Calendar.

If in the former case (the Ornaments Rubric) some of us resisted authority, a very little reflection will show that there is no serious inconsistency. There were many who were absolutely unable to do violence to their conscience, and contradict a plain English statement inserted in the forefront of the Book of Common Prayer without any qualification, by admitting that "such ornaments shall be retained and be in use" meant shall "not be retained and not be in use." But there is no such difficulty about the necessity for Episcopal sanction in the case of special services. In the one case something is ordered; in the other only much to be desired.

Then there is a second suggestion, which may help very largely to the ultimate attainment of our purpose. It is to press upon priests and laity the great desirability of having Funeral Celebrations. Let the priest propose, or the laity plead for, them when they

are about to commit their beloved dead to the grave.

If you compare our Burial Service with the other special Offices, you will see at a glance what a serious difference there is. Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Matrimony, Visitation of the Sick; there are prayers in abundance for the child to be baptized or confirmed; for those who desire to be joined together by an eternal bond; for one upon whom God's chastening hand has been laid. For one and all, intercession is not only an integral part, but, so to speak, the very breath of the service, sanctifying with the Blessed Spirit those more immediately concerned. But in the Burial Service prayer becomes utterly selfish—"deliver *us* not into the bitter pains of eternal death;" suffer *us* not at our last hour, for any pains of death, to fall from Thee." It is true we hear the voice of thanksgiving and hope, but how few, unfamiliar with the explanation I have given, ever realise that the words which follow "that we with all those that are departed may have our perfect consummation and bliss," is a prayer for them as well as for ourselves!

Is it not commonly believed that it is a prayer for us and us alone, viz., that we may one day enjoy in

their company that which is already assured to them, in part at least in Paradise, to be perfected in future in Heaven? It is from the desire to remedy this very serious defect that we wish to encourage what is practically the revival of the use of the First Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth—viz., to have, where circumstances permit, a Celebration not only for the strength and comfort of the friends and relations, but pre-eminently for Eucharistic Intercession in behalf of the departed. No permission is required for this, unless at least we wish for a special Collect, Epistle and Gospel, there being no restriction laid upon any parish priest touching the number of Celebrations he may lawfully have.

In case the scantiness of the Intercession contained in the letter of the Service seems hardly to meet the mourners' need, they have only to be reminded that it may be expanded at the time in their private devotions, which are equally efficacious, if they are in accordance with God's will and blended with the All-sufficient pleading of Christ's own Sacrifice.

If we are contented to pray as the Early Church did in her Liturgies,[1] it will be for the peace of the

[1] For numerous quotations from the Liturgies, consult

departed — that peace which passeth all understanding; for his rest, which is not idleness but restful activity; for light, from the reflection of that which no man can approach unto; for refreshment, in the Presence of Him Who promised it to all who should come to Him; for purification that progressive process which everyone must pass through before he is fitted to "see God" in the Beatific Vision; and for the complete effacement of those spots and stains which sin cannot but leave even upon the purest soul. Or if we wish for a prayer of an all-embracing nature, let it be for the fulfilment in the departed of "the blessing of Thy promises, which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man, which Thou hast prepared, O God, for them that love Thy holy Name."[1] These and other such like supplications will supply ample material for the fullest intercession.

Chapters viii., ix., x. of *After Death*, by the Author, where the above and many others will be found. It will be seen that prayers for the forgiveness of wilful sin were extremely rare. There are many, however, for involuntary sins, for faults and failings.

[1] This beautiful and comprehensive prayer is from the Liturgy of S. Mark. *Cf.* Brightman i., p. 129.

Those of us who have laid our beloved dead to rest with a solemn Celebration, and have not only heard the words of the interceding Priest pleading the atoning Sacrifice offered "for all Thy whole Church," visible and invisible, and have joined our prayers to his, have not only felt that they must bring a blessing to the departed, but by a reflex action have found a great and lasting comfort to our own souls. Further, in the higher atmosphere into which the last Office for the dead was thus raised, an intense reality has been given to the meaning of "the Communion of the Saints."

My last word shall be for hope and encouragement. When I think of the change that has passed over England in our relationship to the dead, some circumstances come into my mind, which have an important bearing upon it. When Bishop Fraser, of Manchester, died, the Dean told me that before his body was taken out of the Cathedral, after the first part of the Burial Service, he pronounced the Benediction in a slightly altered form so as to embrace the departed, thus: "The blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be *upon him*, and amongst you and remain with you always."

And such was the strength of the Protestant feeling about Prayers for the dead in that city, that what he had done was taken up in the Press, and called forth so much strong language that he invited a large number of persons of different denominations and religious views, who were interested in the subject, to meet together for a conference upon it. He asked me, as one who had studied the question, to give the opening address. This I did, and though the resolution he drew up was expressed in very moderate terms, amongst a number of speakers, it only received the support of four or five. It created not a little surprise that the best speech in favour of it was made by a Baptist Minister. Only twenty years have elapsed; but what a different reception would the subject receive in the same place from a similar gathering to-day!

Then hear the testimony of two of the most honoured Churchmen of the last generation, written to me a few years earlier. Dean Church, of S. Paul's Cathedral, wrote that though "Prayers for the dead still carried with them very shocking and distressing associations," he was full of hope that one of the results of a calm and dispassionate examination of

the primitive evidence then lately put forth, would be, to use his exact words, "That our children will be able to enjoy, without offence, a primitive liberty of prayer, which we, their fathers, could only do grudgingly and under suspicion."[1]

The other, Canon Liddon, almost in despair, asked in reference to the same subject, "How long men would continue to go on appealing to the Primitive Church, and yet ignore or deny what was as much a part of its life, public as well as private, as the worship of our Lord — and much more so than the recognition of some parts of our present Canon of the New Testament."[2]

Had they been alive to-day, how surprised both of them would have been! One would have said that his most sanguine expectations had been exceeded; the other, that his indignation might have been spared, for when he wrote, though he little thought it, he had actually reached the very dawn of returning day!

And now, in drawing to a close, I would ask those especially who are trying to recover for the Church of England the fulness of her ancient heritage to

[1] February 18th, 1879. [2] December 26th, 1879.

take heart of grace from this experience. They have seen the practice of interceding for the departed wonderfully revivified in our private devotions; they will see the same in public worship; only let them be content to wait patiently upon God's good pleasure; for if it be in accordance with His will, "it will surely come," it may be, "it will not tarry."

FINIS.

Jarrold and Sons, Ltd., Printers, The Empire Press, Norwich.

DATE DUE

BV 828 .L82 1907

Luckock, Herbert Mortimer, 1833-1909.

Eucharistic sacrifice and intercession for the

DEMCO

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BV828.L82 1907
Luckock, Herb Eucharistic sacrifice and
3 0645 0007 6741 4